00031902

NOT TO BE ISSUED
OUT OF THE LIBRARY.

00031902

Digitized with financial assistance from

HT Parekh FOUNDATION

An Initiative by HDFC

WITH YOU, RIGHT THROUGH

on 27 November, 2018

HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION.

FROM THE ACCESSION OF CHARLES I.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH OF

M. GUIZOT,

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY IN THE FACULTY OF LITERATURE AT PARIS, AND MINISTER OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION IN FRANCE.

BY LOUISE H. R. COUTIER.

VOL. I.

31902
ac

V c 12

OXFORD: D. A. TALBOYS,

AND 113, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

M DCCC XXXVIII.

1838

God
942.062
Gui/His
31902

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE.

It may be asked why, after the many works that have appeared in England on the subject of which these volumes treat, it has been thought necessary to translate the present work. For an answer the reader is referred to M. Guizot's preface, in which he gives his reasons for writing the book at all. There, after doing full justice to the merit of those authors who have enriched English literature with their views of this important period in the national life of their country, he shows that a complete history of the English revolution is still found wanting, and that the French revolution having placed the events of 1688 in a new light, the narrative of Hume and other historians are no longer sufficient to satisfy the present age.

In fact, though time, like an eternal night, may for ever spread the veil of obscurity over some events, it passes over others as a transitory shadow, from which arises the dawn of a new day. Thus time has proceeded, civilisation proceeded, and nations have grown rich by their experience; the sun of knowledge has risen, and vested the dim obscurity of distance in its true colours. Let us hope that we are about to enjoy the full meridian splendour of the light

that shines upon us, and cast away that philosophy which would represent man as toiling for ever to reach a certain height, from which, when attained, he can never move but to recede. What! in the life of a nation is there no great end held in view by Providence? or must we suppose that the necessities of life, its luxuries, its pleasures, are the only motors of that mighty mass of living creatures whose industry, commerce, arts, and genius are for ever active and in progress? Is there no deeper, no purer motive to their exertions than the food of the day, the gratification of the hour? For thousands there may not be; but, unconsciously, they are forwarding a nobler end. In seeking the amelioration of their own lot, the faculties of their minds are called into action, and these can be of no advantage to themselves till rendered useful to their fellow-creatures. Thus the civilisation of nations is constantly in progress. But is that progress, like the life of man, to be followed by decrepitude and death? it is an awful, chilling question; and who shall answer it? What say those ruins which are scattered over the surface of the globe? are they not the gray tombstones of mighty nations that have long passed away? Go into the vast unconscious desert; see Palmyra, the great, the beautiful, the fallen; ask where are the sons of genius who once walked among the gorgeous pile; alas! echo answers "where!" All this is true, but too true. All over the globe, in this island, are scattered memorials of an en-

lightened race, to whom conjecture alone has given a name; and these, I grant, appear to sanction the cheerless sentence of utter vanity which many sages in every century have pronounced against earthly things. But I must believe another creed than this; as I said before, Do not let us adopt a philosophy whose cold tenets would fain chill every warm and glowing energy of the human breast, make the noblest hopes appear but delusive visions, and divest the Great Author of all good himself of his own true attribute of Omnipotent Love! He stands not cold and immutable, viewing the anguish, the deep anxiety with which the good and great seek, in the fervency of their hearts, to ameliorate the state of human affairs, as the impassible rock views the idle chafing of the waves—this stern, cold mockery is not the character of Him who assists even manual labour with the dew and the sunbeam. It is not because great nations, whose wealth and power astonished the world, committed great faults and fell, that we are necessarily doomed to do the same; their fall is a warning to us against that pride and luxury by which they were hurried into the abyss, not an example of the natural consequence of time upon civilised communities. Take, however, what view we may of the question, we must all own that we are agents in the hands of an inscrutable Providence, with whose designs we cannot become acquainted, though continually and mysteriously engaged in

forwarding their development. On the ultimate ends of revolutions we can therefore form no conjectures; we all know from experience that all human institutions partake more or less of imperfection; that the least imperfect form of government under which we can live, cannot ensure that frail and delicate thing—human happiness, dependent as it is on that which no human power can control. Nevertheless, that the gradual progress of society from a state of barbarism to refinement, is carried on by a series of revolutions, is certain. The work neither begun nor ceased with the memorable epoch which these volumes pourtray, and this M. Guizot clearly demonstrates. In the history here given that gentleman does not relate events alone, but points out the motives by which the different parties were actuated, with all the acuteness of one who has studied the human heart and the spirit of revolutions with philosophy and truth. His History of the Revolution therefore appears to me to possess a peculiar interest; the actors live and move before the reader's eyes, and the whole scene reappears before him. The cause of liberty is advocated throughout, not with the blindness of passion, but with the stedfast dignity of earnest belief. The feelings and errors of all parties are appreciated with impartiality; in short, the work is one that must attract from all Englishmen the attention it so eminently deserves. I therefore trust, that in laying before the public the present translation,

I am rendering a service to those who are not sufficiently versed in the French language to enjoy the original. French being, as it were, my native language, I hope I have in no instance mistaken the author's meaning; though, I fear, that as a foreigner, I may not always have expressed it so elegantly as I could wish. I have to regret that my distance from a public library has rendered it impossible for me, in many instances, to verify M. Guizot's references and give the very words of the author whom he quotes. I should certainly not have failed in this had the works been within my reach; as it is, I hope the reader will pardon a deficiency which I have supplied by the best means in my power—a strict fidelity to the author's text.

LOUISE H. R. COUTIER.

ENHAM, JANUARY, 1838.

THE AUTHOR'S PREFACE.

I HAVE published the original memoirs of the English revolution; I now publish its History. Before the French revolution this was the greatest event that had happened in Europe.

I am not afraid that its importance will be forgotten; the French revolution, in surpassing, did not lessen its greatness; both are victories in the same war, and to the profit of the same cause; glory belongs to both, and instead of eclipsing they enhance each other's merits. My fear is rather that their true character should not be understood, and that the proper place which belongs to them in the history of the world, should not be assigned to them.

If we adopt an opinion now widely diffused, it would seem that the two revolutions are strange events emanating from principles and conceived in designs unheard of before, which have thrown society out of its ancient and natural course; that they were hurricanes, earthquakes, in short, that they belonged to those mysterious phenomena which men cannot explain, that burst suddenly from the will of Providence either to renovate or destroy. Friends and enemies, panegyrists, and detractors, all hold this same language. According

to some, these glorious events have for the first time brought truth, liberty, and justice to light; before they happened, all was absurdity, iniquity, and tyranny; by them the human race has been saved. According to others, these deplorable events have interrupted a long golden age of wisdom, virtue, and happiness; the perpetrators of them having proclaimed maxims, put forward pretensions, and committed crimes, till then without example or parallel. Nations, in a fit of insanity, forsook their accustomed road; an abyss suddenly gaped beneath their feet. Thus all parties, whether they bless, deplore, or condemn revolutions, agree in forgetting every thing else in their presence. By all they are entirely cut off from the past, and are themselves regarded as responsible for the destiny of the world. In short, they are either loaded with unmitigated anathema or with glory.

It is time to forsake these puerile and unfounded declamations.

Far from having interrupted the natural course of events in Europe, neither the English nor the French revolution either said, wished, or did anything that had not been said, wished, done, or attempted, hundreds of times before. They proclaimed the illegality of absolute power. Free concurrence with regard to laws and taxes, and the right to resist with arms and force, were among the constitutive principles of the feudal administration; and the church has often repeated these words of St. Isodorus, found in the canons of

the fourth council of Toledo: "He is king who rules his people with justice; if he act otherwise he shall no longer be king." These canons attacked prerogative and laboured to introduce a greater degree of equality in social order. Every king in Europe has done the same; and down to the present day, the progress of civil equality has been founded and measured by the progress of royalty. These canons required that public offices should be accessible to every individual, that merit alone should be the standard of their distribution, and that power should be conferred by election. This is the fundamental principle of the interior government of the church; and the church has not only acted upon it, but loudly proclaimed its virtue. And whether we consider the general doctrines of the two revolutions, or the things to which they were applied—whether the government, the state, or the civil legislation are spoken of, property or persons, liberty or power—nothing will be found altogether peculiar to them, nothing but what may likewise be met with, or but what had at least its origin in what are called peaceable times.

This is not all. The principles, the designs, the efforts, which are exclusively attributed to the English and to the French revolutions, not only preceded them by several centuries, but are precisely those to which society in Europe owes all its progress. Was it by their disturbances, and their privileges, by the brutality of their strength, and by crushing men beneath their

yoke, that the feudal aristocracy took a part in the moral growth of nations? No; but the feudal aristocracy struggled against royal tyranny, exercised the right of resistance, and maintained the maxims of liberty. For what have nations blessed kings? for their pretensions to divine right and to absolute power? for their profusion, for the splendid pageantry of their courts? No; but for combating the feudal system and aristocratical privileges, for having introduced something like unity in legislation, and in the administration; in short, for having aided the progress of equality. Whence, again, do the clergy derive their power? how have they advanced the march of civilisation? Is it by separating themselves from the people, by opposing the growth of human reason, and sanctioning tyranny in the name of heaven? No; but the clergy have always gathered together in their churches, and under the law of God, the great and small, the poor and rich, the weak and the powerful of the earth; they have honoured and cultivated science, instituted schools, favoured the propagation of knowledge, and the development of mind. Look into the history of the conquerors of the world, examine the influence of the several classes that have decided its destiny, and wherever any good is perceptible, whenever the tardy gratitude of man testifies of some great service rendered to humanity, it will be found that a step was taken towards the same object, sought by the English

and the French revolutions, and one of the same principles they endeavoured to establish is invariably presented to the moral vision.

Let us not then any longer regard them as monstrous phenomena in the history of Europe; let us hear no more of their unprecedented pretensions, their infernal contrivances. They have advanced civilisation in the path it has pursued for the last fourteen centuries; they proclaimed the maxims and forwarded the works to which man has at all times been indebted for the development of his nature, and the amelioration of his condition; they have done that which has been by turns the glory and the merit of the aristocracy, the clergy, and of kings.

I do not think they will much longer be obstinately and sweepingly condemned because they are sullied with errors, misfortunes, and crimes. All this we must admit to the fullest extent to their adversaries; we should even surpass them in severity, and only examine their accusations to supply their omissions. But then, let me summon them in return to draw up a catalogue of the errors, crimes, and miseries of those times and those powers they defend; and I doubt whether they will dare to accept my challenge.

But it will be asked, By what then are the two revolutions distinguishable from any other epoch; and, if they did but continue the work of ages, how came they by their name, and how did they,

in fact, alter the features of the moral world? The answer is this:

Divers powers have successively prevailed in European society, and led by turns the march of civilisation. After the fall of the Roman empire and the invasion of the Barbarians, in the dissolution of all ties and the ruin of all powers, dominion everywhere belonged to bold and brutal force. The conquering aristocracy took possession of all things; persons and property, the country and the people. In vain did a few great men, Charlemagne in France, Alfred in England, attempt to submit this chaos to the unity of a monarchy. All union was impossible. The feudal hierarchy was the only form that society would accept. It invaded everything, the church as well as the state; bishops and abbots were barons, and the king was chief suzerain. How gross and wavering soever this organisation, yet Europe is indebted to it for its first step from barbarism. It was among the proprietors of fiefs, by their intercourse, their laws, their customs, their feelings, their ideas, that the civilisation of Europe began.

The barons heavily oppressed the people. The clergy alone endeavoured to reclaim a little reason, justice, and humanity in favour of all. Those who held no place in the feudal hierarchy, had no other asylum than the churches, nor any other protectors than the priests; though very insufficient, yet being the only one this pro-

tection was immense. Besides this, the priests alone offered food to the moral nature of man; to the cravings of thought, knowledge, hope, and belief; unconquerable cravings, that overcome every obstacle, and outlive all misfortune. The church soon acquired a prodigious power in every part of Europe. Kingly power in its infancy, lent it fresh power by borrowing its assistance. Thus the preponderance passed from the hands of the aristocratical conquerors to the clergy.

In alliance with the church, royalty soon took precedence of its rivals; but no sooner had the clergy given it their assistance than they wished to enslave it. In this new struggle, royalty sometimes called to its aid the barons, now become much less formidable, and more frequently the commons and the people, already strong enough to help, though not sufficiently so to demand a high reward for their services. By their aid royalty triumphed in its second struggle, became almost the ruling power, and was invested with the confidence of nations.

Such is the history of ancient Europe. The feudal aristocracy, the clergy, and royalty, by turns took possession of it, and successively presided over its progress and destiny. It was to their co-existence and to their struggles that Europe for a long time was indebted for all it acquired of liberty, prosperity, and knowledge; in short, for the development of its civilisation.

In England, in the seventeenth century, and

in France in the eighteenth, all struggle between these three powers had ceased. They lived together in sluggish peace; it might even be said, that they had lost their historical character, and even the remembrance of those deeds that had, of old, formed their power and their fame. The aristocracy no longer protected public liberties, not even their own; royalty no longer sought to abolish aristocratical privileges, but seemed, on the contrary, favourable to their possessors in return for their servility. The clergy, the spiritual power, stood in awe of the human understanding, and, not knowing how to guide it further, sought by threats to check its career. Still civilisation followed its course, and became daily more general and active. Forsaken by their ancient leaders, astonished at their apathy and disposition, seeing that less was done for them as their desires multiplied and their strength augmented, the people began to think that it behoved them to transact their own affairs; and, assuming at once the various functions which all besides had forsaken, they claimed, of the crown, an extension of liberty, of the aristocracy, equality, and of the clergy, the rights of human intellect. Hence broke out revolutions.

These brought forth, for the benefit of this new power, what had already occurred several times in Europe; they gave to society, leaders that would and could direct it in its progress. By this only claim had the aristocracy, the church, and the kingly power by turns been pos-

sessed of precedence. The people now took the same right, through the same means, and in the name of the same necessities.

Such is the real history, the predominant character of the English revolution as well as that of France. After they had been considered as absolutely alike, it was said that they had nothing but appearances in common. It was urged, that the first was political rather than social; the second sought to change at once both society and government; the one sought liberty, the other equality; one, rather religious than political, only substituted dogma for dogma, a church for a church; the other, more especially philosophical, claimed the full independence of reason. This ingenious comparison is not without truth, but nearly as superficial, as light, as the opinion it pretends to correct. While, through the exterior resemblance of the two revolutions, a great dissimilitude is perceptible, so, beneath their dissimilitude, a still more profound resemblance is hidden. It is true that the English revolution, from the same causes that brought it forth an age before ours, retains a deeper trace of the ancient social state. In England, free institutions, originating in barbarous times, had survived the despotism they could not prevent; the feudal aristocracy, or, at least, a portion of them, had united their cause to that of the people. Royalty, even in the days of its supremacy, had never been fully and peaceably absolute; the national church itself had begun the religious

reform, thus encouraging the daring inquiries of the mind. Everywhere, in the laws, the creed, and the habits of the people, revolution found its work half accomplished, and from that order of things which it sought to change, came at once assistance and obstacles, useful allies, and still powerful adversaries. And thus did it present a singular mixture of elements, to all appearance the most contrary. At once aristocratic and popular, religious and philosophical, appealing alternately to laws and theories; sometimes proclaiming a new yoke for conscience, and at others its entire liberty; sometimes narrowly confined within the limits of facts, at others soaring to the most daring attempts; placed, in short, between the ancient and the new state of things, rather as a bridge of connection than as an abyss of separation.

The most terrible union, on the contrary, reigned throughout the French revolution. The 'new spirit' alone prevailed; and 'the old system,' far from taking any part in the movement, only sought to defend itself against it; a defence that it could not maintain an instant, being as deficient in strength as it was in virtue. On the day of explosion one only fact remained true and powerful,—the general civilisation of the country. In this great but only result, old institutions, old manners, old creeds, the remembrances of the past, in short, the whole national life, was swallowed up. So many active and glorious ages had only produced France. Hence the immense

results of the revolution, and also the immensity of its errors: the revolution possessed absolute power.

Undoubtedly the difference between the two revolutions is great, and worthy to be noted. It strikes us particularly, when, undertaking to unravel, if I might so express it, the physiognomy and individual character that belong to each, they are considered in themselves as isolated events detached from general history. But let them take their places in the natural course of ages, and examine what they have done towards the development of European civilisation, the resemblance will reappear, and predominate over all apparent dissimilitude. Created by the same causes, the fall of the feudal aristocracy, the church, and kingly power, they both laboured to obtain the same result, the dominion of the public in public affairs. They struggled for liberty against absolute power, for equality against privilege, for progressive and general interests against stationary and individual interests. Their situations were different, their strength unequal. What one clearly conceived, the other had but faintly and imperfectly imagined; in the career that one followed, the other soon became stationary; on the same battle-field one found victory, the other defeat; one sinned through its cynical principles, the other through its hypocrisy; one was wiser, the other more powerful; but their means of success alone differed; their tendency as well as their origin was the same;

their wishes, their efforts, their progress, were directed towards the same end; what one attempted or accomplished, the other attempted and accomplished also. Though guilty of religious persecution, the English revolution saw the banner of religious liberty unfolded in the ranks of her followers; notwithstanding its aristocratical alliances, it founded the power of the commons; more busied with political than civil order, it still claimed a more simple legislation, —parliamentary reform, and the abolition of birthright and entails; and though disappointed in its premature hopes, it caused English society to take a wide step from the monstrous inequality of the feudal system. In a word, the analogy of the two revolutions is such, that the first would never have been understood had not the second taken place.

In fact, in our days, the English revolution has changed in appearance. Hume [a] formed, by his History, the opinion of Europe; and, notwithstanding the name of Mirabeau [b], Mrs. Macauley's declamations were not able to shake his authority. All at once, the minds of the people threw off their trammels. A number of works

[a] Hume published his first volume of the History of the Stuarts in 1754, and the second in 1756.

[b] Mrs. Macauley's work was to have been a 'History of England from the Accession of James the First to the Elevation of the House of Hanover,' but it reaches no further than the death of James the Second. This work was published in England from 1763 to 1783. Of the French translation, under the name of Mirabeau, only two volumes appeared, published in 1791.

attest that the revolution became again the object of lively sympathy, and that the narrative and opinions of Hume had ceased to satisfy the imagination and reason of the public. A great orator, Mr. Fox[c], and many distinguished writers, Mr. Malcolm Laing[d], Macdiarmid[e], Brodie[f], Lingard[g], Godwin[h], and others, hastened to gratify this newly-roused curiosity. This interest having originated in France, could scarcely fail to be felt there. 'L' Histoire de Cromwell,' by M. Villemain, 'L' Histoire de la Révolution de 1688,' by M. Mazure, evidently prove that in France also Hume was no longer sufficient; and I have been able, myself, to publish the voluminous Collection of the Memoirs of that epoch, without fatiguing the attention or exhausting the curiosity of readers[i].

[c] History of the Two Last Kings of the House of Stuart, one vol. 4to. London, 1808. The French translation, published in Paris 1809, in two volumes, 8vo. is very incomplete.

[d] History of Scotland from the Union of the Crowns to the Union of the Kingdoms, 4 vols. 8vo. The first edition dates from 1800.

[e] Lives of British Statesmen, 2 vols. 8vo. second edition, London, 1820. The second volume contains the Lives of Strafford and Clarendon.

[f] History of the British Empire, from the Accession of Charles the First to the Restoration of Charles the Second, 4 vols. 8vo. Edinburgh, 1822.

[g] History of England; the 9th and 10th volumes, London, 1825, contain the reigns of James the First and of Charles the First.

[h] History of the Commonwealth of England; London, 1824; only the first volume has appeared.—[It is now completed in 4 vols. 8vo.]

[i] This Collection, now completed, forms 25 vols. 8vo. Paris, Bechet, aîné.

It would little become me to enter here into a minute examination of these works; but I fearlessly assert that, without the French revolution, without the clear light it threw on the struggle of the Stuarts and the English people, they would not possess the new merits that distinguish them. I shall only advance as a proof, the difference that is to be remarked between those written in Great Britain and those produced in France. How great soever the patriotic interest awakened in English writers by the revolution of 1640, even when they enlist under the banners of one of the parties which it formed, historical criticism reigns throughout their works; they apply themselves in particular to the discovery of exact facts, by comparing and debating divers testimonies. What they relate, is to them an ancient history with which they are well acquainted, not a drama acted in their presence; a past age that they pride themselves on knowing well, but in which they *live* not. Mr. Brodie partakes of all the prejudices, suspicions, and passions of the bitterest puritans against Charles the First and the cavaliers, while he is blind to any faults or any errors in the puritans. One would think so much passion would produce an animated narrative; and that, at least, the party exciting so much sympathy in the mind of the writer, would be represented with warmth and truth. Such, however, is not the case. Notwithstanding the violence of his peculiar notions, Mr. Brodie studies but sees not, discusses but represents not;

he admires the popular party, but does not bring it before the reader's eye; and his work is a learned and useful dissertation, not a moral and animated history. Mr. Lingard partakes of none of the affections nor opinions of Mr. Brodie. He remains impartial between the king and the parliament, he pleads neither the cause of one nor the other, and seeks not to refute the errors of his predecessors; he even boasts of not having opened the work of Hume since he began his own; he says he wrote with the aid of original documents, with the times he wished to picture forth even before his eyes, and with the firm resolution of shunning all systematical views. Does animation arise from this impartiality? Not at all. Mr. Lingard's impartiality is but indifference; a Roman catholic priest himself, he cares little whether the protestants or the presbyterians triumphed; and indifference helped him no better than passion did Mr. Brodie to penetrate beyond the exterior, and, one might almost say, the material form of events; and, again, the principal merit of his work is, in having carefully examined facts, collected them with tolerable accuracy, and well disposed them. Mr. Malcolm Laing describes with more sagacity the political character of the revolution; he has very well shown, that, from the first, without exactly understanding its own aim, the revolution tried to put down prerogative and to place it in the hands of the commons, thus substituting parliamentary for royal government, and that its only basis was

this result. But the moral side of the epoch, the religious enthusiasm, the popular passions, party intrigues, personal contentions, in short, none of those scenes in which human nature shows itself freed from the restraint of laws and customs, are to be found in his book. It is the narrative of a clear-sighted judge, but of one who has only inspected written documents, and who neither calls before him the actors nor the witnesses of the scenes he relates. I might review all the works with which England has been recently enriched on this subject; they all present the same character—a new interest for this great crisis of national life, a more attentive study of the facts that relate to it, a keener feeling of its merits, a juster appreciation of its causes and consequences; still it is but meditation and science; the work of erudition or philosophy. I seek in vain for that natural sympathy in the writer for his subject that gives to history the light of life; and if either Hampden or Clarendon were to return to life, I scarcely can believe that they would recognise their own times.

I open 'l'Histoire de Cromwell,' by M. Villemain, and find myself in presence of another scene. It is not so complete, so learned, nor so exact as several of the works I have mentioned, but, throughout, there is a quick and keen comprehension of the opinions, passions, and vicissitudes of revolutions; of public dispositions and individual characters, of the unconquerable nature and the changing of parties. The historian's

mind knows how to understand all situations and ideas; his imagination is moved by real and deep impressions; his impartiality, perhaps rather too sceptical, is yet more animated than is frequently the passion itself of the advocates of one party; and though the revolution appears in his book only confined in the too narrow frame of a biography, it is clearer and more animated than in any other work.

The reason of this is, that, without speaking of the advantages of talent, M. Villemain had the advantage of situation. He has looked at and judged of the English revolution from the midst of that of France; he found in the men and the events beneath his own eyes, the key to understand those he had to paint; he drew life from his own times and infused it into the times he wished to recall before his readers.

I refrain from carrying these reflections farther; I have said so much only to point out how great is the analogy between the two epochs, and also to explain how a Frenchman might think that the history of the English revolution has not yet been written in a fully satisfactory manner, and that he may be allowed to attempt it. I have carefully studied nearly all the ancient and modern works that have been written on the subject; I did not fear that this study would alter the sincerity of my own impressions or the independence of my judgment; it seems to me that there is too much timidity in dreading so much that an auxiliary should become a master,

or too much pride in refusing so absolutely all help. Yet, if I do not deceive myself, it will easily be recognised, that original documents have more particularly been my guides. I have nothing to say of the 'Memoirs;' I sought in the 'Notices' that I affixed to them when they were published, to define their character and worth; and those to which I did not give a place in my 'Collection,' though I have made use of them in my 'History,' appeared to me of too little importance to be dwelt upon. As for the collections of official acts and documents, they are very numerous; and, though often explored, still abound in unknown treasures. I have looked into those of Rushworth, Thurlow, the journals of both houses, the 'Parliamentary History,' the ancient one as well as that of Mr. Cobbett, the 'Collection of State Trials,' and a great number of other works of the same kind, which it would be uninteresting to enumerate here. I also found, not only in the English, but in the French pamphlets of the time, some curious information; for the French public was more occupied than may be generally supposed by the English revolution; many pamphlets were published for and against it, and the Frondeurs took advantage more than once of its example against Mazarine and the court. I must also say, to do justice to a man and a work now too much neglected, that I have often consulted with profit the History of England, by Rapin Thoiras; and, notwithstanding the inferiority of the writer's talents, the English

revolution is perhaps better understood in it, and more completely displayed than in the works of most of his successors.

To conclude, let me be allowed to express here my gratitude to those persons who in France as well as England, have had the kindness to give my work an anticipated favour, and lent me the most valuable assistance. Amongst others, to whom I am indebted, I have to thank the kindness of Sir James Mackintosh, as inexhaustible as his mind and knowledge, for indications and advice that no one but himself could have given me; and one of those, who, amongst us, are the best informed with the past and present state of England, M. Gallois, has bestowed upon me, with a benevolence that I have some right to consider as friendship, both the treasures of his library and his conversation.

PARIS, APRIL, 1826.

CONTENTS

OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

BOOK THE FIRST.

1625—1629.

Accession of Charles the First to the throne, 1; state of England, 3; meeting of the first parliament, 17; spirit of liberty manifested therein, ib.; parliament dissolved, 21; first attempts at arbitrary government, ib.; their bad success, 22; second parliament, ib.; impeachment of the duke of Buckingham, 25; parliament dissolved, 28; bad administration of Buckingham, ib.; third parliament, 33; petition of rights, 40; prorogation of parliament, 46; murder of Buckingham, ib.; second session of parliament, 48; fresh causes of public discontent, ib.; the king's displeasure, 49; third dissolution of parliament, 51.

BOOK THE SECOND.

1629—1640.

Intentions of the king and his council, 53; leading members of parliament prosecuted, 55; apparent apathy of the country, 56; struggle of the court and ministry, 57; the queen, ib.; Strafford, 59; Laud, 61; incoherence and discredit of government, 63; civil and religious tyranny, 66; its effects on the different classes of the nation, 68; trial of Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, 99; Hampden, 103; insurrection in Scotland, 107; first war with the Scots, 112; peace

of Berwick, 120; short parliament in 1640, 128; second war with Scotland, 131; its bad success, 133; convocation of the long parliament, 137.

BOOK THE THIRD.

1640—1642.

Opening of parliament, 138; its proceedings, 139; state of religious and political parties, 140; the king's concessions, 150; negotiations between the king and the leaders of parliament, 156; conspiracy in the army, 158; Strafford's trial and death, 160-175; the king's journey to Scotland, 180; insurrection in Ireland, 186; debate on the Remonstrance, 190; the king's return, 195; progress of the revolution, 196; riots, 202; affair of the five members, 209; the king leaves London, 221; the queen's departure for the continent, 231; affair of the militia, ib.; negotiations, 232; the king fixes his residence at York, 236; both parties prepare for war, ib.; an entrance into Hull is refused to the king, 244; vain attempts at conciliation, 253; formation of the two armies, 255-260.

BOOK THE FOURTH.

1642—1643.

Breaking out of the civil war, 261; the king erects his standard at Nottingham, 263; battle of Edgehill, 268; alarms in London, 272; combat of Brentford, 274; attempts at negotiation, 278; character of the civil war, 280; the queen returns from the continent, 285; negotiations at Oxford, 290; suspicions entertained against the earl of Essex, 294; dissensions in the interior of parliament, 296; conspiracy of the royalists in the city, 302; death of Hampden, 306; the parliamentary army several times defeated, 309; energy of the parliament, 314; efforts of the partisans of peace in the

house, 316; the king's project to march upon London, 324; the project defeated, 326; siege of Gloucester, ib.; raised by Essex, 329; battle of Newbury, 331; death of lord Falkland, 332; alliance of parliament with the Scots, 334; triumphant return of Essex to London, 335.

ELUCIDATIONS AND HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS.

I. The paper found in the hat of Felton, the murderer of the duke of Buckingham 339
II. Fines imposed for the profit of the crown from 1629 to 1640 340
III. A list of the army raised by parliament in 1642 . 342

HISTORY OF

THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION,

FROM THE ACCESSION OF CHARLES I.

BOOK THE FIRST.

1625—1629.

On the 27th of March, 1625, Charles the First ascended the throne, and immediately convoked the great council of the nation[a]. Scarcely was the house of commons assembled[b], when Sir Benjamin Rudyard, a man highly esteemed, reckoned in the last reign among the opponents of the court, rose and proposed that henceforth nothing should be neglected to maintain the most perfect harmony between the king and his people: "for," said he, "we have every thing to hope from the prince who governs us for the happiness and liberty of our country[c]." Indeed, the people rejoiced and were filled with hope. In this case it was not merely those uncertain hopes and tumultuous joys which naturally arise at the beginning of every new reign; they were serious, general, and seemingly well founded. Charles was a prince

[a] April 2nd, 1625. [b] June 18th.
[c] June 22nd, 1625. Cobbett's Parl. Hist. vol. ii. 5.

whose conduct was grave and pure, and whose piety was acknowledged; diligent, learned, frugal, but little given to prodigality; reserved, yet not morose; dignified, yet not arrogant. He maintained order and decorum in his house; his whole demeanour announced a noble, upright mind, a friend of justice; his deportment and manners awed his courtiers, and pleased his subjects; his virtues had gained him the esteem of all good people. Sickened of the meanness, the talkative and familiar pedantry, the inert and pusillanimous politics of James the First, England now looked forward to happiness and liberty under a king whom she could respect. But neither Charles nor the English nation knew how much they were already estranged from each other, nor the causes which had been long at work and growing in power to prevent them from mutually appreciating each other, and living together in harmony.

Two revolutions, one visible and even glaring, the other hidden and unknown, were taking place at this epoch; the first, in the kingly power of Europe, the second in the state of society, and the manners of the English people.

At this time, kingly power on the continent, freed from its ancient trammels, had become almost everywhere absolute. In France, in Spain, and in most of the states of the German empire, monarchs had conquered the feudal aristocracy, and ceased to protect the liberty of the common people, having no longer need of

them to defend themselves from other enemies. The higher nobility, as if they had lost all resentment arising from their defeat, crowded around the throne, half proud of the brilliant display of their conquerors. The commons, timid and dispersed, enjoyed the amelioration which had taken place, and a wealth till then unknown. They laboured to enrich and enlighten themselves, without a thought of aspiring to a place in the government of the state. The pomp of courts, the promptitude of government, the extent and regularity of wars, everywhere proclaimed the preponderance of royal power. The maxims of divine right and passive obedience generally prevailed, and were but weakly contested where not assented to. In short, the progress of civilisation, letters, arts, and of internal peace and prosperity, adorned the triumph of pure monarchy, inspired princes with a presumptuous confidence, and the nations they governed with an obedience mixed with admiration.

In England, royalty had not remained an idle spectator of this change in Europe. From the accession of the house of Tudor[a], it had no longer to contend with those proud barons, who, too weak to struggle individually against their king, had, formerly, by uniting together, been able to maintain their rights, and had associated themselves by force in the exercise of royal

[a] In 1485.

power. Mutilated, impoverished, reduced by their own excesses, and in particular by the wars of the two roses, this aristocracy, which had so long remained invincible, resigned itself, almost without a struggle, first to the tyranny of Henry the Eighth, and afterwards to the skilful government of Elizabeth. Henry, become the head of the Church, and the possessor of immense estates, and by the bountiful distribution of these among families of whose prosperity he was the founder, or whose fortunes he re-established, began the metamorphosis of barons into courtiers. Under Elizabeth this metamorphosis was completed. As a woman and a queen, she was naturally pleased with a numerous and brilliant court, which she found means to render subservient to her views; the nobility crowded around her with delight, and without exciting much public discontent. All were eager to devote themselves to the service of a popular sovereign, and to seek by intrigues, amid festivals, the favour of a queen who possessed the affections of her people.

The maxims, forms, and language, and too often even the exercise of unlimited power, were forgiven to a government useful and glorious to the nation; the affection of the people covered the servility of her courtiers, and towards a woman, whose perils were all public perils, unbounded devotion seemed a law to the nobility, a duty to the protestant and citizen.

The Stuarts did not fail to advance in the

path which, since the reign of the Tudors, the English monarchs had entered upon.

By birth a Scotchman, and of the blood of Guise, James the First, by his family connections and the habits of his country, was attached to France, and accustomed to seek his allies and his models among those continental monarchs, which an English prince would regard as his enemies: indeed, he showed himself still more imbued than Elizabeth and even than Henry the Eighth himself, with the maxims which, at that time, constituted in Europe absolute monarchy. He professed them with the pride of a theologian and the complaisance of a king; opposing on every occasion, by the height of his pretensions, the timidity of his acts and the limits of his power. Forced, sometimes, to vindicate by more direct and simple arguments, the measures of his government, such as arbitrary imprisonments or illegal taxes, he alleged the example of his brother of France or of Spain. "The king of England," said his ministers to the house of commons, "cannot be of lower degree than his equals[e]." So great, even in England, was the influence of the revolution which had been accomplished in the state of monarchy on the continent, that even the adversaries of the court were embarrassed by this language, and felt nearly convinced, that the dignity of the English prince required that he should enjoy the same

[e] Journals of the House of Commons, April 18th, May 12th and 21st, 1614.

rights, though at a loss how to reconcile this necessary equality among kings with the liberties of their own country.

Nurtured from his infancy in these maxims, prince Charles, upon arriving at the age of manhood, was still more exposed to their contagion. The infanta of Spain had been promised to him: the duke of Buckingham suggested to him the idea of going secretly to Madrid to sue in person for her hand and heart. So romantic a design pleased the youthful imagination of Charles, but the king's consent was necessary. James refused, flew into a violent passion, then wept, and at last gave up, rather to the importunities of his favourite, than to his son[f]. Charles was received at Madrid with great honours[g], and there saw monarchy in all its splendour—majestic, supreme—exacting both from its attendants and from the people a devotedness and a respect almost religious; rarely contradicted, and always sure of carrying all before it, the sovereign by his will alone being above all contradiction. The marriage of Charles with the infanta did not take place, but he married instead Henrietta-Maria of France[h]; for his father had resolved that beyond those two courts, there was no alliance worthy of the dignity of his throne. The impressions made on the English prince by this

[f] Clarendon's Hist. Rebell. vol. i. p. 18—30. [g] March, 1623.

[h] The marriage was negotiated in 1624, but was not definitively concluded till May, 1625. It took place in England, in June, of the same year.

union, were similar to those he had received in Spain; and the monarchy of Paris and Madrid became in his eyes a model of the natural and legitimate condition of a king.

Thus English monarchy, at least in the monarch, his counsellors, and his court, followed the same bent as the monarchies of the continent. All the symptoms and efforts, too, of the revolution already accomplished abroad, began to show themselves here; a revolution whose most moderate pretensions allowed the liberties of subjects to exist only as subordinate rights, or rather as concessions for which they were indebted to the sovereign's generosity.

But while on the continent this revolution met with nations as yet incapable of resisting it, perhaps even disposed to receive it, in England a counter-revolution, secretly at work in society, had already undermined the ground on which absolute monarchy designed to tread; and thus prepared its ruin while in a state of progress.

When the Tudors began to reign, the higher aristocracy bowed and humbled themselves to the throne; the English commons were not able to take their place in the struggle of liberty against power; they would not even have dared to pretend to the honours of the contest. In the fourteenth century, the time of their most rapid progress, they had limited their ambition to the recognition of their primitive rights, and to the obtaining of a few incomplete and insecure guarantees. They had never entertained the thought

of having a share in the sovereignty, and of taking a permanent and decisive part in the government of the country; such high notions as these were confined to the nobles.

In the sixteenth century, aggrieved and ruined, like the barons by civil wars, the commons coveted above all things order and peace; this monarchy granted them, and, although very imperfectly, still with greater securities and under better regulations than they had ever enjoyed it before. They accepted this benefit with heartfelt gratitude. Separated from their ancient leaders, and having none to support them in presence of the throne and those barons who once were their allies, their language was humble, their conduct timid, and the king had reason to believe that henceforward the people would be as submissive as the nobility.

But the people of England were not like those of the continent, a body of citizens and peasants, loosely and feebly bound together, slowly freed from the yoke of servitude, and still bowed down by its weight. As early as the fourteenth century, the English house of commons had been strengthened by the entrance into it of all those little landed proprietors, forming the most numerous portion of the English aristocracy, who, having neither sufficient influence nor wealth to get a share with the barons of sovereign power, were yet proud of the same origin, and of having for a long time possessed the same rights. These, having become the leaders

of the people, had more than once given a strength and boldness to the national will which never could have been given to it by the people alone. Like the people, they had been weakened and dejected by long-suffering and civil discord, but when peace was re-established they soon recovered their importance and their pride. While the higher nobility crowded around the court, to make up for their losses in borrowed dignities, as corrupting as they were precarious, and which, without giving them back their former fortunes, separated them more and more from the people, the gentry, the freeholders, the citizens, solely occupied in improving their lands or extending their trade, increased in riches and credit, and became daily more closely united, drawing the people under their influence; and, without show, without political design, almost unknown to themselves, were taking possession of the social strength, the true source of power.

In towns, commerce and industry were rapidly advancing: London acquired immense wealth; the king, the court, and most of the great nobles of the kingdom, always insolent and needy, became its debtors. Mercantile navigation, the nursery of royal navigation, greatly increased in activity and enterprise; numerous merchant-vessels were fitted out; and the sailors seemed to catch the spirit and share in the interests of the merchant-adventurers.

In the country, things followed the same course. Property was divided. The feudal laws

had created obstacles to the sale and subdivision of fiefs: a statute of Henry the Seventh, in an indirect manner, had, at least in part, abolished these laws; the high nobility received this as a favour, and hastened to profit by it. They parted also with most of the vast domains that Henry the Eighth had bestowed upon them. The latter favoured these sales in order to augment the number of possessors of ecclesiastical lands; and the courtiers were forced to have recourse to them, as corruption did not furnish them sufficient means. At last, Elizabeth, to save herself the pain of having to ask for subsidies, always disagreeable, even to the party that obtains them, sold a considerable number of the royal domains. Nearly all these lands were bought by gentlemen who lived on their estates, by freeholders who cultivated their own property, or by citizens retiring from trade, for these alone had acquired by their industry or economy the means of purchasing what prince and courtiers were compelled to sell[j]. Agriculture prospered, the counties and towns were filled with a rich population, at once active and independent; and the revolution that had put into their hands so great a portion of the public wealth, was so rapid, that, in 1628, at the opening of parliament, the house of commons was three times as rich as the house of lords[k].

[j] Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, vol. v. p. 6.

[k] Hume (History of England, vol. vi. p. 209, Oxford, 1826) quotes Sanderson and Walker to confirm this assertion, both historians of little authority; but I could not discover, in writers

By degrees, as this revolution proceeded, the commons again began to grow uneasy under tyranny. With greater possessions, greater securities became necessary. Rights for a long time possessed by the sovereign without dispute, and still without obstacle, were now regarded as abuses, as a greater number of persons began to feel their pressure; it was not only asked whether he had always possessed them, but whether he ever *ought* to have possessed them? By degrees, the remembrance of ancient liberties, of the efforts that had obtained the great charter, and of the maxims it consecrated, returned to the minds of the people. The court spoke with contempt of old times, as gross and barbarous; the people recalled them with affection, as bold and free. Their glorious conquests were no longer of service, yet all was not lost. Parliament had not ceased to meet; sovereigns, finding it submissive, had often employed it even as an instrument of their power. Under Henry the Eighth, Mary, and Elizabeth, juries had showed themselves complaisant and even servile, but still they existed. The towns had preserved their charters, the corporations their immunities. In short, though for a long time strangers to resistance, the commons had still the means of resistance in their hand; they did not lack free institutions half so much as the power and will

whose testimony deserves more confidence, so exact a valuation of the comparative riches of the two houses; but every thing attests that the house of commons was much richer than the house of lords.

to make use of them. This power returned with the revolution, which caused their material greatness to make such rapid progress. To encourage them in the work, it was enough that another revolution broke out, which gave them a moral greatness, emboldened their ambition, elevated their thoughts, made resistance a duty, and dominion a necessity. The Reformation had this effect.

Proclaimed in England by a despot, the Reformation was begun there by tyranny. Scarcely born, she persecuted her partisans as well as her enemies. Henry the Eighth with one hand built scaffolds for the catholics, and, with the other, signed death warrants for such protestants as refused to subscribe to his creed, and approve the government which the new church received from him.

Thus, from the beginning, there were two reformations; one undertaken by the king, the other by the people: the first wavering, servile, more attached to temporal interests than to modes of faith, alarmed at the agitation to which it had given birth, and seeking to borrow from catholicism every thing that in leaving it could be retained; the second, spontaneous, ardent, above all worldly considerations, and willing to suffer all the consequences of its principles; in short, a true moral revolution, undertaken in the name and with all the enthusiasm of faith.

Though united for some time,—under queen Mary by mutual suffering, and at the accession

of Elizabeth by mutual joy, the two reformations could not fail to separate, and struggle against each other. Such was now their situation, when political questions forced themselves into their debates. In separating herself from the independent head of the catholic church, the Anglican church had lost all her proper strength, and now only held her rights and power in subordination to the rights and power of the sovereign of the state. She was thus led to enlist in the cause of civil despotism, and was forced to profess its maxims in order to legalise her own origin, and to serve its interests in order to preserve her own. The nonconformists, on the other hand, in attacking their religious opponents, found themselves, at the same time, compelled to attack their temporal sovereign, and, in order to carry on the reformation of the church, to claim the rights and liberties of citizens. The king had succeeded to the pope; the Anglican clergy were the successors of the catholic clergy, exchanging only the authority of the pontiff for that of the king: in every thing, whether a dogma, a ceremony, a prayer, the erection of an altar, or the fashion of a surplice, the royal will was consulted as well as that of the bishops, and government had as much hand in it as discipline and faith.

In this perilous necessity of a double struggle against the king and the church, of a simultaneous reformation in religion and state, the nonconformists for some time hesitated. Popery, and every thing that resembled it, was hateful

and illegal in their eyes; but they had not as yet arrived at this pitch with regard to kingly authority, even when despotic. Henry the Eighth had begun the reformation, Elizabeth had supported it. The boldest puritans felt some reluctance to measure the rights and prescribe limits to a power to which they owed so much; and as often as any individuals made a step towards this holy object, the astonished nation seemed grateful but dared not follow them.

The time however was now come when something must be done; reform must either retrograde or a change must be made in the government; for government alone obstructed its progress. The minds of men by degrees became less timid; the force of conscience gave rise to ideas and designs of a bolder character: religious creeds needed political rights; and people began to inquire why they did not possess them? who had usurped them? by what right? and what were the proper means to recover them? The obscure citizen, who, a short time back, would have humbled himself in the dust at the mere name of Elizabeth, and who, most likely, would never have turned towards the throne a bolder look, if he had not discovered, in the tyranny of the bishops, that of the queen, now firmly interrogated both on their pretensions, when constrained so to do, in vindication of his faith. It was more particularly among country gentlemen, freeholders, citizens, and the people, that this desire of examining and resisting the govern-

ment, as well as the form of religion, chiefly spread; it was by these that the reformation had been first introduced, and these now wished to carry it forward. Caring little about religious creeds, the court and part of the lower nobility were satisfied with the innovations which Henry the Eighth and his successors had introduced, and upheld the Anglican church from conviction, indifference, self-interest, or loyalty.

Less under the influence of power, and more exposed to its violence, the English commons from this time assumed an entirely new position, both in their notions of royal power and in their conduct towards it. Their timidity daily disappeared and their ambition grew. The citizen, the freeholder, even the peasant, raised his thoughts far above his condition. He was a christian; in his own house, among his friends, he boldly examined the mysteries of *divine* power; what *terrestrial* power was there then so high that he should abstain from its consideration? In the Holy Scriptures he found the laws of God; to obey them he was forced to resist human laws; thus it became his duty to find out where the latter should be restricted. Whoever seeks to know the limits of a master's rights will soon be led to discover their origin: the nature of royal power, of all power, its ancient limits, its recent usurpations, the conditions and the sources of its legitimacy, became the subject of inquiry and debate in every corner of England: an inquiry at first timid, and undertaken rather

from necessity than choice; debate for a long time secret, and which, even when begun, the people were afraid to carry to any length, but which had the effect of giving to their minds a boldness and vigour hitherto unknown. Even Elizabeth, popular and respected as she was, felt the effects of this growing disposition, and rigorously repressed it, though always careful not to brave the peril of popular discontent[1]. Under James the First it was much worse. Weak and despised, he wished to be thought a despot; the dogmatic display of his impotent pretensions only provoked a greater degree of boldness, which he irritated without repressing. The minds of the people received a new impulse; there was no longer any thing to inspire them with awe or respect; the monarch was a butt for their laughter, his favourites the objects of their indignation. On the throne, among the courtiers, arrogance was shorn of its strength and even of its splendour; their base corruption inspired the thinking with profound disgust, and degraded in the eyes of the people all distinctions of rank that came under their observation. It was no longer the privilege of vigorous and prying minds alone to look them in the face and measure them coolly: this privilege had become popular. The opposition soon appeared as haughty and more confident than the government; and it was no longer the opposition of the great barons

[1] See the proofs, etc. at the end of this vol. No. 1.

of the house of lords, it was an opposition that had sprung up in the house of commons, now resolved to have a part and influence in the government, which it had never before enjoyed. Their indifference to the pompous threats of the monarch, and the haughty yet respectful character of their language, showed that every thing was changed; that they thought proudly, and intended to act with vigour. The secret influence of this moral revolution had indeed already spread so far, that, in 1621, James the First, when about to receive a committee of the commons, which came to present him with a severe remonstrance, said, with an irony not half so bitter as his feelings, "Let twelve arm-chairs be prepared, I am going to receive twelve kings[m]."

In truth, when Charles the First convoke his parliament, it was almost a senate of king that an absolute monarch called around hi throne. Neither prince nor people, but least of al the latter, had as yet unravelled the principle o measured the strength of their claims; they met with the sincere hope and intention of settling any differences they might have, when, in fact, their disunion was already consummated, for they all thought as sovereigns.

The session was no sooner opened than the commons directed their inquiries to every part

[m] Hist. of England, by Rapin Thoiras, vol. viii. p. 183, 4th edition, Hague, 1749: Kennet, Complete Hist. of England, vol. iii. p. 743.

of the government; foreign affairs as well as domestic, negotiations, alliances, the employment of past subsidies, and of subsidies to come; the state of religion, the repression of popery; nothing appeared to them to be beyond their authority. They complained of the state of the fleet, and of the little protection it afforded to English commerce [n], of Dr. Montague, the king's chaplain, who defended the Romish church and preached up passive obedience [o]. They expected from the king alone the redress of all these grievances, while they showed by their questions, their petitions, and by the expression of their advice, their intention of interfering in all that should be done.

But few reproaches were directed to the government of Charles; it had hardly commenced. Yet so boundless and searching an examination of public affairs already appeared to him an encroachment; and the freedom of speech in which the house of commons indulged offended him. One of the court party, Mr. Edward Clarke, attempted to complain of this in the house: "unbecoming and bitter words," he said, "had been made use of:" a general cry summoned him to appear at the bar, and explain; he would not retract, and was very near being expelled [p].

This language, indeed, was sufficiently bold,

[n] August 11th, 1625; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 33.
[o] July 7th, 1625; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 6.
[p] August 6th, 1625; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 13.

though couched in humble words. "We do not ask of the king to put away bad counsellors, as parliament did under Henry the Fourth and Henry the Sixth. We do not wish to interfere in their choice, as was done under Edward the Second, Richard the Second, Henry the Fourth, and Henry the Sixth; nor that those whom the king shall have chosen should be obliged to take oath before parliament, as was done under Richard the Second and Edward the Second; nor that parliament should prescribe to them beforehand their mode of conduct, as it thought fit to do under Henry the Third and Henry the Fourth; nor even that his majesty should promise, as Henry the Third did, that he would do all things with the consent of parliament, and nothing without it. We only presume to make known, like faithful subjects, our moderate requests. We hope that as the king is surrounded with wise, pious, and honourable counsellors, he will, in concert with them, set about remedying the evils of the state, and will not suffer himself to be guided by a single individual, or by inexperienced counsellors[q]." Thus spoke Sir Robert Cotton, a man celebrated for his learning and moderation, and the commons, while protesting with him that they had no intention of imitating the boldness of the parliaments of old, still rejoiced to hear them thus called to mind.

[q] August 6th. Parl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 14—17. This speech was taken from the posthumous works of Sir Robert Cotton, published by Howell in 1651.

The king was displeased, yet he did not complain. Such language, though importunate, did not at present appear to him dangerous: besides, he wanted subsidies. The last parliament had made a great outcry for a war with Spain, and the one now assembled he thought could not refuse to support it. Charles begged that the means of carrying it on should be furnished him without delay, promising, at the same time, to redress all just grievances.

But the house would no longer trust to promises, not even to those of a king who had not yet broken his word, and whom they respected. Princes inherit the faults as well as the thrones of their predecessors. Charles thought he had nothing to fear as he had committed no crime; the people thought that all past abuses should be extirpated, that nothing might be feared for the future; the commons, at first, granted a moderate subsidy, and only voted the customs for one year, though the king had, with a rare sincerity, just exposed the state of the exchequer, and had granted every document and explanation. The urgent necessity of the king was evident; and the lords thought there was but little wisdom in coming to a rupture so soon, without a motive, with a young monarch who showed himself so well inclined to agree with his parliament.

The commons, without declaring they would grant no larger subsidies, proceeded with the examination of grievances; and, without an-

nouncing their intention, they showed that they were bent upon their redress before proceeding to any other business. The king was indignant that any one should thus dare to prescribe laws to him, and suppose that he would give up to force, or acknowledge himself unable to govern. It was a usurpation of the sovereignty which belonged to him alone, and which in no case he would suffer to be brought in question. Parliament was dissolved[r].

Thus, notwithstanding their mutual good intentions, the prince and the people had only met to disagree; they separated without either party feeling any weakness or believing themselves wrong: both felt certain of the lawfulness of their pretensions, and equally resolved to persist in them. The commons protested they were devoted to the king, but would not yield up to him their liberties. The king asserted, that he respected the liberties of his subjects, but that he knew very well how to govern without their assistance.

This he immediately attempted to do. Orders from the council were forwarded to the lord lieutenants of the counties, enjoining them to raise by way of loan, the money wanted by the king[s]. They were commanded to apply to all wealthy citizens, and to send to the court a list of such persons as should refuse to comply or show themselves backward in lending. The

[r] August 12th, 1625.

[s] Old Parl. Hist. vol. vi. p. 407; London, 1793.

affection and fears of the people were still calculated upon. In the mean time, the fleet sailed on an expedition against Cadiz, the bay of which was crowded with richly-freighted vessels. In order, however, to humour the people a little, the clergy were directed to proceed against the papists, who were forbidden to go further than five miles from their place of abode without permission, and received orders to recall such children from the continent as they had sent there to be educated. They were also compelled to deliver up their arms. The commons had cried out for their liberties; the king in return exercised a little tyranny against their enemies.

This contemptible expedient did not satisfy them: besides, even the proceedings against the papists were equivocal and suspected; for the king secretly sold them dispensations or granted them pardons. The loan brought but little money to the treasury; the expedition against Cadiz failed, and the public attributed its failure to the ignorance of the admiral and the drunkenness of the troops; the government was accused of neither knowing how to choose commanders, nor how to maintain good conduct among the soldiers. Six months had scarcely passed when a second parliament was thought necessary[1]. Rancour had not taken deep root in the mind of the young king, and his despotism was both timid and confident. He thought the commons would

[1] February 6th, 1628.

be delighted to be re-assembled so soon; perhaps he even hoped that the firmness he had shown would render them more obedient. He had moreover taken measures to keep from parliament the more popular orators. The earl of Bristol, a personal enemy of the duke of Buckingham, received no summons to attend. Sir Edward Coke, Sir Robert Philips, Sir Thomas Wentworth, Sir Francis Seymour [u], and others, named sheriffs of their counties, could not be elected. It was not doubted but in their absence the commons would be more submissive, for, it was said, the people love the king, only that a few factious spirits lead them astray.

The commons, on the other hand, thought that it was the king who was led astray, and that to bring him back to his people, it was only necessary to rescue him from his favourite. The first parliament had merely insisted upon the redress of public grievances, by delaying the subsidies; the one now assembled resolved to strike nearer the throne, at the author of all their grievances —the duke of Buckingham [x].

The duke was one of those men who seem born to shine in courts and to displease nations. Handsome, presumptuous, magnificent, rash and careless, sincere and warm in his attachments, open and haughty in his hatred, alike incapable of virtue or hypocrisy, he governed without poli-

[u] Seven in all: the three others, who were of less note, were, Sir Grey Palmer, Sir William Fleetwood, and Mr. Edward Alford.

[x] February 21st, 1626.

tical design, and neither troubled himself concerning the interests of the country nor those of the king. His whole care was his own greatness, and that greatness consisted in displaying his own powerful influence over the king. He had once endeavoured to render himself popular, and had succeeded. The rupture of the intended marriage of Charles with the infanta of Spain had been his work. But public favour was, with him, only a means of forcing the king to his purpose—public favour he lost, but he scarcely bestowed a regret upon it, proud of having retained over Charles the same ascendancy he had so insolently exercised over James. But his ambition was unsupported by talents; the gratification of frivolous passions was the sole aim of his intrigues; to seduce a woman, to get rid of a rival, he compromised, with arrogant insensibility, sometimes the king, sometimes the country. The power of such a man, to a people daily becoming more serious, appeared an insult as well as a misfortune; and the duke continued to hold the highest functions in the state[y], without appearing to the people aught but an upstart without glory —an incapable and daring favourite.

[y] He was earl, marquis, and duke of Buckingham, earl of Coventry, viscount Villiers, lord high admiral of England and Ireland, governor-general of the navy, master of the horse, warden of the Cinque Ports, governor of Dovor Castle, lord high keeper; high steward of Westminster, constable of Windsor, knight of the garter, gentleman of the bedchamber, privy councillor, etc. The royal domains that had been given him were valued at £284,395 sterling, etc. Brodie, Hist. of the British Empire, etc. vol. ii. p. 122.

The attack of the commons was violent: it was difficult to prove against Buckingham any legal crime; the house voted that public report alone afforded sufficient grounds for proceeding against him; and it collected together all the chief aggressions that public rumour accused him of[z]. The duke cleared himself of most of these attacks; but it availed him little. It was the maladministration that the commons wished to reform: though innocent of theft, murder, or treason, Buckingham was still no less obnoxious. The boldness of the commons gave courage to the disaffected at court. The earl of Bristol complained of not having been called to parliament[a]. Buckingham, who feared him, wished to keep him at a distance. The lords acknowledged the earl's right, and Charles sent him a summons to parliament, but at the same time ordered him to remain on his estates. The earl had recourse a second time to the house, beseeching them to inquire, whether the privileges of the peers of the realm did not require that he should be allowed to take his seat in the house. The king immediately impeached him of high treason[b]. In order to defend himself, Bristol, in his turn, accused Buckingham[c]. Thus the king saw his favourite impeached at the same time by the representatives of the people and by an old courtier.

[z] April 22nd, 1626; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 32.

[a] In March 1626; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 72.

[b] May 1st, 1626; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 79.

[c] Ibid. p. 68.

This was interfering too much with Charles's power, and offended his pride. Buckingham had not been convicted of any crime, it seemed then mere wanton malice against his favourite and friend. He said to the commons: "I must let you know, that I shall not suffer you to prosecute any of my servants, and far less those who are placed in high situations and near my person. Formerly the question was, 'What shall be done for the man whom the king honours?' Now there are people who weary themselves in finding out what shall be done against the man whom the king thinks fit to honour. I desire that you should hasten the business of the subsidies, if not it will be the worse for you; and if any harm happen, I think I shall be the last who will suffer by it[d]." At the same time, he forbade the judges to answer the questions which the house had submitted to them concerning one part of the earl of Bristol's[e] charge, fearing that the answer would be in the earl's favour[f]. The judges were silent; but the commons did not desist. Eight of its members were appointed to support, in a conference with the upper house, the accusation against Buckingham[g]. When the conference was over, the king caused two of the eight members, Sir Dudley Diggs, and Sir John Elliot,

[d] Parl. Hist. col. 49, 50. Ibid. col. 106.

[f] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 105.

[g] May 3rd, 1626; Journals of the House of Commons. They were, Sir Dudley Diggs, Mr. Herbert, Mr. Selden, Mr. Glanville, Mr. Pym, Mr. Whitby, Mr. Wandesford, and Sir John Elliot.

to be sent to the Tower for insolence of speech[h].

The commons, incensed beyond measure, declared they would do nothing till its members were set at liberty[i]. In vain the friends of the court sought to frighten them respecting the fate of the parliament itself[k]; their threats only appeared insults, and they were forced to apologise for having insinuated that the king might very likely be tempted to govern without their aid, like the princes on the continent. The two prisoners were released[l].

Incited by this example, the lords claimed also the liberty of the earl of Arundel, who had been lately confined in the Tower; the king was obliged to comply[m].

Tired of seeing himself conquered by adversaries he had himself called together, and whom he could at any time disperse, and hearing that the commons were preparing a general remonstrance, Charles, persuaded by his restless favourite, resolved to evade a position that would degrade him both in the eyes of all Europe and in his own. The report spread that parliament was soon to be dissolved. The upper house, which began to seek popular favour, hastened to address a petition to the king to dissuade him from this design; and all the peers were desirous

[h] May 11th, 1626; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 103.
[i] Ibid. p. 119.
[k] May 13th, 1626; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 120.
[l] Ibid. p. 122—124.
[m] June 8th; ibid. vol. ii. p. 25.

of following the committee that was chosen to present it to the king. "Not a moment longer," cried the king, hastily, in reply to their request; the dissolution was immediately pronounced, and a royal proclamation explained the reasons for it[n]. The projected remonstrance of the commons was publicly burnt, and whoever possessed a copy of it, was also ordered to burn it[o]. Lord Arundel was confined a prisoner in his own house, and Bristol once more sent to the Tower[p]; the duke of Buckingham thought himself saved, and Charles felt himself king.

His joy was as short as his foresight: even absolute power has its necessities. Engaged in a ruinous war against Spain and Austria, Charles had not an army with which he could at the same time conquer his subjects and his enemies. Though not numerous, and badly disciplined, his troops cost him very dear; puritanism reigned among the sailors, and he dared not confide in the militia, who were more ready to obey the citizens and country gentlemen, than the king. He had removed adversaries, but not troubles and obstacles; the insane pride of Buckingham caused new ones to arise. To avenge himself on the cardinal de Richelieu, who would not let him return to Paris to follow up his daring success with the queen of France, he persuaded his master to enter into a war against that country. The interests of the protestants served as a pre-

[n] June 15th, 1626; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 193.
[o] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 207. [p] Ibid. vol. ii. p. 193.

text. Rochelle was besieged, and must be saved to prevent the ruin of the French protestants. It was hoped that, for this cause, the people would passionately fly to arms: or, at least, that they would allow themselves to be oppressed.

A general loan was ordered to be raised, of the same amount as the subsidies that parliament had promised, but not voted. The commissioners appointed to levy these loans were enjoined to interrogate the refractory on the grounds of their refusals, to learn who had persuaded them, by what discourse, and with what design. This was at once an attack upon the fortunes and opinions of individuals. A few regiments were sent into the counties, and quartered upon the inhabitants. The seaports and maritime districts received orders to supply and equip a certain number of armed vessels, the first attempt of Charles at ship-money. The city of London was rated at twenty ships: it was remarked that this was more than Elizabeth had demanded to repel the invincible armada of Spain: the reply was, that the precedents of former times were obedience and not objections[q].

To justify such sayings, the doctrine of passive obedience was everywhere preached. The archbishop of Canterbury, George Abbot, a popular and virtuous prelate, who refused to sanction the spread of these sermons in his diocese, was suspended in his office and banished

[q] Whitelocke, Memorials of English Affairs, etc. p. 7, folio edit. 1682.

from London[r]. Too much had been presumed on the passions of the people; they could not be persuaded to forget their liberty under the pretext of religion. Besides, they were suspicious of this new zeal; let them be free, let a parliament be called, and they would lend a much firmer help to the protestants on the continent. A great number of citizens refused to contribute to the loan; some, weak and obscure, were pressed into the fleet or army; others were cast into prison or charged with distant missions which they dared not refuse. Discontent, without breaking out into sedition, was not limited to murmurs only. Five gentlemen, detained by an order of the ministry, claimed at the court of king's bench, as a right belonging to every Englishman, to be set at liberty upon finding bail[s]. An imperious king and an irritated nation hurried on the trial. The king insisted that the judges should declare as a principle, that no man arrested by his orders should be allowed to find bail; the people inquired whether all guarantee was lost for the protection of their liberties? The judges rejected the demand for bail and sent the defendants back to prison; but without establishing the principle the king had prescribed to them: already struck with a double fear, they

[r] Ibid. p. 7. 1682.

[s] Their names were, Sir Thomas Darnel, Sir John Corbet, Sir Walter Earl, Sir John Heveringham, and Sir Edmund Hampden. This last must not be mistaken for his cousin John Hampden, who afterwards became so celebrated.

neither dared to show themselves servile nor just; and, to save themselves from trouble, they refused their consent to despotism, and their aid to liberty.

In their jealous ardour to maintain the rights of all, the people took under their protection even the soldiers who served as the instruments of tyranny. On all sides complaints were made of their want of discipline; to repress their disorders martial law was enforced. It was thought wrong that such arbitrary power should be exercised without the sanction of parliament; and that Englishmen, soldiers or not, employed in vexing or in protecting their fellow-citizens should be deprived of the support of the law.

In the midst of this as yet impotent, but more and more aggressive irritation, the news arrived that the expedition to Rochelle, commanded by Buckingham in person, had failed[t]. The ignorance of the general had caused this reverse; he had neither been able to take the isle of Rhé, nor to bring off his force without losing the best of his troops, officers as well as soldiers. It was long since England had paid so dear for so many losses[u]. In town and country, a multitude of families, beloved and respected by the people, were in mourning. The indignation became general. The farmer left his fields, the appren-

[t] October 20th, 1627.

[u] This disaster is painted with a great deal of energy in a letter from Hollis to Sir Thomas Wentworth, of the 19th of November, 1627. Strafford's Letters and Despatches, vol. i. p. 4.

tice his shop, in order to inquire whether his master, a gentleman, or citizen, had not lost a brother, or a son; and they returned to their neighbours with an account of the disasters they had heard, of the trouble they had seen, cursing Buckingham, and censuring the king. Losses of another kind also embittered still more the minds of the people; the French navy endangered the safety and prosperity of English commerce; their vessels were compelled to remain in port; the sailors, unemployed, talked of the defeat of the royal fleet, and of the causes of their own inaction. The gentry, the citizens, and the people became daily more closely united in one common feeling of resentment.

When Buckingham returned, notwithstanding his arrogance, he felt the weight of public hatred, and the necessity of screening himself from its effects; besides which, some expedient must be found, to get out of trouble and find resources. Every tyrannical measure, that could possibly be put in force, had been tried. Sir Robert Cotton, as one of the mildest of the popular party, was called to the king's assistance. He spoke with wisdom and frankness, insisted on the just grievances of the nation, and on the necessity of redressing them in order to obtain the support of the people, and quoted the words of Burleigh to queen Elizabeth: "Gain their hearts, and you will soon have their arms and purses[x]." He ad-

[x] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 212—217.

vised the calling of a fresh parliament, and in order to bring the duke of Buckingham into favour with the public, it was agreed, that he should propose it in council. The king followed Sir Robert's advice. The prisons were immediately opened[y]; men who had been confined for their resistance to tyranny suddenly came forward, passing abruptly from the dungeons to which they had been insultingly condemned, to the possession of power. The public received them with transport; twenty-seven of them were elected members of the new parliament[z]. It met. "Gentlemen," said the king, at the opening of the session, "let every one henceforward act according to his conscience. If it happen, (which God forbid,) that you should not do your duties in contributing to the necessities of the state, I must, in discharge of my conscience, use those other means, which God has put into my hands, in order to save that which the follies of some particular men might otherwise endanger. Take not this as a threat, for I scorn to threaten any but my equals, but as an admonition, from him who, by nature and duty, has most care of your preservation and prosperity[a]." The lord-keeper speaking after the king, added: "This mode of parliamentary supplies, as his majesty told you, he hath chosen, not as the only way, but as the fittest; not because he is destitute of others, but

[y] Seventy-eight at that time released. Rushworth, vol. i. p. 473.

[z] March 17th, 1628. Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 218.

because it is most agreeable to the goodness of his own most gracious disposition, and to the desire and weal of his people. If this be deferred, necessity and the sword of the enemy will oblige us to employ other means. Remember his majesty's admonition; I say, remember it [b]."

Thus Charles sought by his speech to disguise his situation: a haughty solicitor, sinking under the weight of his faults and his misfortunes, he yet threatened to employ that independent and absolute majesty which set him above all faults and reverses. So infatuated was he with his own supremacy, that it never entered into his mind that it could suffer any change: and full of arrogance, yet sincere, he thought it due to his honour and his rank to assume the tone and claim the rights of tyranny even while borrowing the assistance of liberty.

The commons were not moved by these threats; their thoughts were as proud and inflexible as his. They were resolved solemnly to proclaim their liberties, to oblige the reigning power to acknowledge them as primitive and independent, and to suffer no longer that any one right should pass for a concession, nor any encroachment for a right. Neither leaders nor followers were wanting for this great design. The whole nation rallied round the parliament. Within this sanctuary, bold and clever men con-

[b] Parl. Hist. col. 221.

sulted how it should be accomplished; Sir Edward Coke, the pride of magistracy, no less illustrious for his firmness than for his knowlege[c]; Sir Thomas Wentworth[d], afterwards lord Strafford, young, ardent, eloquent, born to command, and whose ambition was then satisfied with the admiration of his country; Denzil Hollis[e], the youngest son of lord Clare, in childhood the companion of Charles, but the sincere friend of liberty, and too proud to serve under a favourite; Pym, a learned barrister, eminently skilled in the knowledge of the rights and customs of parliament[f], cold yet daring, and well knowing how to conduct himself with prudence as a leader of popular passions; and many others, destined, within a time much less than any of them could anticipate, to such divers fortunes, even to be of opposite parties, were now united by the same principles and hopes. To this fearful coalition the court could only oppose the power of custom, the capricious temerity of Buckingham, and the haughty obstinacy of the king.

The first meetings of the prince and his parliament were friendly; notwithstanding his

[c] Born at Mileham, in Norfolk, 1549; he was then seventy-nine years of age.

[d] Born in London, April 13th, 1593; he was then thirty-five years of age.

[e] Born in 1597, at Houghton, in Nottinghamshire, he was then thirty-one years old.

[f] Born in 1584, in Somersetshire; he was then forty-four years old.

threats, Charles felt that he must bend; while the commons, determined to regain their rights, had a firm design of showing their devotedness to him. Charles was not offended by their freedom of speech; and the speeches were as loyal as they were free. "I beg," said Sir Benjamin Rudyard[g], "that the house may carefully avoid all subjects of vain contention; the hearts of kings are as high as their fortunes, it behoves them to give up when they meet with compliance. Let us prepare a way for the king to return to us as it were voluntarily; I am convinced that he anxiously waits for an opportunity so to do. Let us consecrate all our efforts in bringing the king over to our side, and then we shall obtain all we can desire." All minds were not so peaceably disposed; there were some who foresaw the evils of a fresh rupture, and better understood the incurable nature of absolute power. All, however, showed themselves animated with the same wishes; and the commons taking the lead in the inquiry into grievances and the necessities of the throne, after a fortnight's session[h], unanimously voted a considerable subsidy, though without immediately passing the vote into a law.

Charles's joy was extreme; he forthwith assembled the great council, and informed them of the vote of the house. "When I succeeded to the throne," said he, "I loved parliaments;

[g] March 22nd, 1628; Parl. Hist. col. 235.

[h] April 4th, 1628.

since, I know not how, I have taken a dislike to them; now I find myself again as I was at first, I like them, and I shall rejoice in meeting often with my people. In Christendom this day will gain me more credit than I should have obtained by gaining many battles." The same joy was manifested by the council; Buckingham thought he must, as well as Charles, express his high satisfaction; he congratulated the king on this happy agreement with parliament. "This," said he, "is far more than a subsidy; it is a mine of subsidies, that lie buried in the hearts of your subjects. And now, will your majesty deign to allow me to add a few words: I must own it, for a long time, I have lived in woe; sleep no longer gave me rest, nor fortune content, so deep was my sorrow to pass for the man who estranged the king from his people, and his people from him. Henceforth, it will be clear, that there were a few prejudiced minds who wished to represent me as an evil spirit, for ever coming between a good master and loyal subjects. With the favour of your majesty, I shall do all in my power to show myself as a beneficent spirit, for ever endeavouring to render to all good offices, offices of peace[i]."

The secretary of state, Cooke, represented to the house the king's satisfaction, and the favour that in all things he promised to parliament[k]. The commons congratulated themselves on this;

[i] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 274.

[k] April 7th, 1628.

but Cooke, with the improvident baseness of a courtier, also mentioned the duke of Buckingham, and his speech in the council: the house was offended by it. "Is there, then, a man," said Sir John Elliot, "who dares to believe that his benevolence and his words will be an encouragement to us to fulfil our duties faithfully towards his majesty? or must it be supposed there is a man who could inspire his majesty with more kindness towards us than he would of himself be disposed to show us? I cannot believe it. I am ready to praise, even to thank whoever employs his credit and his efforts for the public good; but so much presumption goes against the customs of our fathers and our own honour; I cannot hear it without astonishment, nor let it pass without blaming it. I hope such an intervention will not be renewed: let us occupy ourselves in serving the king; we shall become, I hope, so useful to him that we shall want no assistance to gain his affection[l]."

This just pride appeared to Charles insolence, to Buckingham a sure symptom of new perils; yet neither one nor the other expressed their feelings, and the house continued its work.

The commons entered into a conference with the upper house to determine together with it the just rights of subjects, and to claim a new and solemn sanction of them from the king[m]. Charles, informed of the designs which the commissioners

[l] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 275.

[m] April 3rd, 1628.

of the commons manifested in these conferences, was greatly displeased. He exhorted the house to hasten the final vote of the subsidies, and his minister added: "I must tell you, with sorrow, it has come to the ears of his majesty, that it was proposed, not only to declaim against the excess of power, but against power itself: this very closely touches the king, and us also whom his hand upholds. Let us talk to the king on the errors that may have slipped into the exercise of his authority, and he will hearken to us; but do not let us speak against the extent of his prerogative: he wishes to redress its faults, but not to mutilate its rights [n]."

On their side, the peers, either servile or timid, persuaded the commons to be contented with asking the king for a declaration, stating, that the great Charter, with the statutes that confirmed it, were in full force, that the liberties of the English people existed the same as in past times, and that the king would only make use of his prerogative for the benefit of his subjects [o].

The king assembled both houses in a solemn meeting, and declared that he looked upon the great Charter as inviolate, the ancient statutes as inviolable, and invited them to depend on his royal word for the preservation of their rights, in which, he said, they would find more security than any new law could give them [p].

[n] April 12th, 1628; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 278.
[o] April 23rd, 1628; ibid. vol. ii. col. 329.
[p] April 28th, 1628; ibid. vol. ii. col. 332.

The commons would neither be intimidated nor seduced: the recent doings had braved the might and passed beyond the foresight of ancient laws; new and explicit guarantees were required which should be invested with the sanction of the whole parliament. It was nothing to have only vaguely renewed promises, so often broken, statutes so long forgotten. Without much debate, respectfully, but immovable, the house drew up the famous bill, known under the name of the 'Petition of Rights,' adopted it, and transmitted it to the upper house to receive its assent[q].

The lords had nothing to say against a bill that consecrated only acknowledged liberties, or repressed abuses universally reproved. Yet the king persisted in his answer, urging that they should trust in his word. He offered to confirm, by a fresh bill, the great Charter and the ancient statutes; addressing counsel upon counsel to the peers, message upon message to the commons; deeply irritated, but prudent and mild in his speech, he still proclaimed his firm resolution to suffer no restriction in any of his rights, and again promised never to abuse them.

The perplexity of the peers was great: how could the liberties of the people be secured without depriving the king of absolute power? That was the question. An amendment was attempted: the bill was adopted with this addition: "We humbly present this petition to your majesty,

[q] May 8th, 1628.

not only with a care of preserving our own liberties, but with due regard to leave entire that sovereign power with which your majesty is trusted for the protection, safety, and happiness of your people[r]."

When the bill thus amended was returned to the commons, "Let us look at our precedents," said Mr. Alford, "and see what they contain: what is sovereign power? according to Bodin, it is that which is free from all condition. We, then, acknowledge a legal power and a royal power; let us give the king what the law gives him, nothing more." "I am unable," said Pym, "to speak on this question, for I know not on what it rests; our petition claims the laws of England; and we have here a power distinct from that of the laws; where will it be found? nowhere; neither in the great Charter nor in any statute; where should we take it from to grant it?" "If we adopt this amendment," said Sir Thomas Wentworth, "we shall leave things in a worse condition than they are in at present; we shall acknowledge in a law *that* sovereign power which our laws have never known[s]."

The house remained firm; the public encouraged it; the peers, too timid to claim liberty openly, were at the same time afraid to give a full sanction to tyranny. The amendment

[r] May 17th, 1628; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 355.
[s] May 18th, 1628; ibid.

was rejected; but out of regard for the peers, an unmeaning sentence was substituted for it. The petition of rights, adopted by both houses, was solemnly presented to the king, who had, at last, promised to receive it[t].

His answer was evasive[u]; he did not sanction the bill, and only repeated what the house had already refused to be satisfied with.

The commons were losing the victory, but they continued the attack[x]. Sir John Elliot recapitulated with violence all the national grievances; a sentinel had orders to remain near the door, and no member was to go out under pain of being sent to the Tower. It was agreed that a general remonstrance should be presented to the king; the committee of subsidies received orders to prepare it. Fear overtook a few; that kind of honest fear which is inspired by the dread of a great disturbance, and which, without calculating who is in the right or what is to be done, would fain request a pause when it feels that passion gains the mastery. Sir John Elliot was accused of personal enmity; Sir Thomas Wentworth of imprudence; Sir Edward Coke, it was said, had always been rude and obstinate[y]. The king hoped to find a means of respite in these feelings, and perhaps even of return to his ancient position. He forbade that henceforth

[t] May 28th, 1628.
[u] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 374—377.
[x] June 3rd, 1628; ibid. col. 380.
[y] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 385.

the house should take any part in affairs of state[z].

The whole house was in a consternation; this was going a great deal too far, and an insult in the eyes of the most moderate. All were silent: "Our sins must be very great," said Sir John Elliot; "God knows with what affection, what zeal, we have done all in our power to win the king's heart! False reports must certainly have drawn upon us this mark of his displeasure. It has been said that we have thrown suspicions on his majesty's ministers; no minister, how dear soever he may be—"

Here the speaker suddenly rose from his chair, and said, with tears in his eyes, "I have orders to interrupt whoever speaks evil of the king's ministers." Sir John sat down again.

"If we cannot speak of these things in parliament," said sir Dudley Diggs, "let us rise and depart, or remain here mute and inactive." Silence was once more general.

"We must speak now or hold our tongues for ever," said Sir Nathaniel Rich; "it does not become us to be silent in such a peril. Silence would save *us* but it will lose the king and the state. Let us go to the lords and tell them of our dangers, and we will then go together to make our joint representations to the king."

All at once the house passed from a state of silent astonishment to one of passion and vio-

[z] June 5th, 1628; ibid. col. 401.

lence; all the members rose and spoke at once amidst the greatest confusion: "The king is good," said Mr. Kirton, "as good as any prince who ever reigned; the enemies of the nation have prevailed over him. But God, I trust, will send us hearts and hands and swords to cut the throats of the king's enemies and of our own."—"It is not the king," answered old Coke, "it is the duke who says to us, do not concern yourselves any longer in state affairs[a]".—"'Tis he, 'Tis he!" was shouted on all sides. The speaker had left his chair; disorder increased in the minds of individuals as well as in the assembly, and none attempted to calm it, for prudent men had nothing to say: passion is sometimes legitimate, even in the eyes of those who are never subject to it.

While the house was thus agitated, and meditating the most violent resolutions, the speaker went out secretly to inform the king of the disturbance and the peril[b]. Fear passed from the house to the court. The next day a milder message explained that which had caused so much irritation[c]: but words were not sufficient. The commons remained much agitated. The German troops, already levied by the care of Buckingham, and who were expected soon to disembark, were spoken of; one member affirmed that, the day before, twelve German officers had arrived in London, and that two English vessels had received orders to bring

[a] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 401—402.
[b] Parl. Hist. col. 403. [c] Ibid. col. 406.

over the soldiers[d]. The subsidies were still in suspense. Charles and his favourite feared more and more to face an opposition which daily became more violent. They made no doubt that the full sanction of the petition of rights would calm everything. The king went to the house of lords, where the commons had also assembled[e]. They had been mistaken, he said, in supposing that in his first answer there remained any latent meaning; and he was ready to give one that would dissipate all suspicion. The petition was read anew, and Charles answered by the usual form, "Let it be law as is desired."

The commons returned in triumph; they had at last obtained a solemn acknowledgment of the liberties of the English people. No publicity must be wanting on so great an occasion; it was agreed that the petition of rights, printed with the king's last answer, should be diffused all over the country, and enrolled not only in both houses, but also in the courts of Westminster. The bill of subsidies was definitively passed. Charles thought his trials were over: "I have done all that concerns me," said he; "if this parliament have not a happy conclusion, yours will be the fault; nothing for the future can be imputed to me[f]."

But an old evil is not so soon eradicated, and the ambition of an irritated nation is never satisfied with the first success. The passing of the

[d] Parl. Hist., col. 408; Rushworth, vol. i. p. 612.
[e] June 7th, 1628. [f] Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 409.

bill of rights was evidently not sufficient. By it reform in theory only was obtained, and this was nothing without reform in practice; for this to be secured a reform of the council was necessary. Now Buckingham was still in power, and the king continued to levy the tonnage and poundage duties without the sanction of parliament. Enlightened by experience on the perils of delay, and blinded by passion to the danger which sudden and harsh demands might occasion, pride and hatred were blended with the instinct of necessity; the commons resolved to deal without delay the last blows. In a week, two more remonstrances were framed, one against the duke, the other to proclaim that tonnage and poundage, like all other taxes, could only exist by becoming law [g].

The king lost all patience, and resolved to give himself at least some respite; he went to the house of lords, had the commons summoned, and prorogued parliament [h].

Two months afterwards, Buckingham was murdered [i]. In the hat of Felton, his murderer, a paper was found on which the last remonstrance of the house was quoted [k]. Felton did not seek to escape, nor to defend himself, but only said that he looked upon the duke as the enemy of the kingdom, shook his head when questioned

[g] June 13th and 21st, 1628; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 420, 431.

[h] June 26th, 1628.

[i] August 23rd, 1628.

[k] See the Elucidations and Historical Documents placed at the end of this volume, No. II.

on his accomplices, and died with composure, yet confessing that he had done wrong[1].

Charles was confounded by so daring a murder, and indignant at the joy which the multitude manifested at it. Upon the close of the session, he had sought to comply with the public wish, by restraining the preachers of passive obedience, and more particularly by severities against the papists, who seemed to be so many victims devoted to the reconciliation between the king and his people. The murder of Buckingham, in which the people saw their deliverance, threw the king back into tyranny. He again bestowed his favour upon the adversarie of parliament: Montague, whom the common had prosecuted, was promoted to the bishopri of Chichester; Mainwaring, whom the house c lords had condemned, was endowed with a rich benefice; Laud, already famous for enthusiastic devotion to the power of the church and king, was translated to the see of London. Public acts corresponded with court favours: the duty of tonnage and poundage was collected with rigour; and the tribunals of exception continued to suspend the course of law. Silently entering again upon a career of despotism, Charles had even some reason to hope for more success in it; he had detached from the popular party one of its most distinguished leaders, its most brilliant orator. Sir Thomas Wentworth was made a

[1] Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 45; State Trials, vol. iii. p. 367.

peer, a privy councillor, and Charles's chief minister, notwithstanding the reproaches and threats of his former friends. "I shall meet you in Westminster Hall," said Pym to him, bidding him adieu; but Wentworth, haughty and ambitious, rushed passionately forward in the path of greatness, far from imagining how odious he would one day become to the friends of liberty. Other defections followed[m]; and Charles, surrounded with new counsellors, of greater ability, more serious, and less unpopular than Buckingham, awaited the approach of the second session of parliament without fear or dread[n].

The commons had scarcely assembled before they inquired in what manner the bill of rights had been published[o]. They learned that instead of the king's second answer, the first evasive one, that which they had rejected, had been added to it. Norton, the king's printer, owned that the day after the prorogation he had received orders thus to alter the legal text, and to destroy all the copies in which the true answer was printed: that of which Charles had so much boasted, when he said, "I have done my part; nothing, for the future, can be imputed to me."

The commons moved for the requisite papers to verify this alteration, and said no more about it, as if ashamed of such a want of honesty: but their silence did not promise forgetfulness[p].

[m] Sir Dudley Diggs, Sir Edw. Lyttleton, Noy, Wandesford, etc.
[n] January 20th, 1629.
[o] January 21st, 1629.
[p] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 435.

All the attacks were renewed against the toleration shown to the papists, the favour granted to false doctrines, the relaxation of morals, the bad distribution of dignities and employments, the proceedings of the courts of exception, the contempt of the liberties of the people[p].

So much was the house carried away, that, on one occasion, it listened eagerly and in silence to a man quite unknown, shabbily dressed, and of a vulgar appearance, who, speaking for the first time, declaimed, in furious and bad language, against the indulgence of a bishop to an obscure preacher, and, as he called him, a rank papist. This was Oliver Cromwell[q].

Charles sought in vain to obtain from the commons a grant of tonnage and poundage, the only purpose for which he had called them together. He tried alternately threats and gentleness, confessing that he considered these taxes, as well as all others, entirely as the gifts of his people, and that it belonged to parliament alone to establish them; yet he insisted upon their being granted to him for the whole of his reign, as they had been to most of his predecessors[r]. The commons were not to be moved; this was the only weapon they could use against absolute power. They found excuses for delay, while they continued pertinaciously to display their

[p] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 438, 466, 473.

[q] February 11th, 1629; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 464: Memoirs of Warwick, p. 203.

[r] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 442.

grievances, though without any determined aim, or without putting forward, as in the preceding parliament, any clear and precise demand. They were a prey to a violent but vague perplexity, and agitated with the feeling of an evil, they knew not how to remedy. The king's patience was nearly exhausted; his demand was refused, without any request being made to him, that he might either sanction or reject, and with an appearance of pure malevolence, as if with the sole design of thwarting his government. It was rumoured that he intended to prorogue them. Sir John Elliot hastily proposed a new remonstrance against the levying of tonnage and poundage[s]. The speaker, alleging an order from the king, refused to have it read. It was insisted upon: he left the chair. Hollis, Valentine, and other members, compelled him to return to it, notwithstanding the efforts of his friends, who endeavoured to rescue him from their hands. "By God," said Hollis, "you shall sit till it shall please the house to depart." "I will not, I cannot, I dare not," cried the speaker. But their violence could not be curbed, and he was forced to keep his place. The king, informed of the tumult, ordered the gentleman usher to withdraw with the mace, which would suspend all further deliberation: the usher, as well as the speaker, was detained, the keys of the hall were taken away from him, and a member, Sir Miles Hobart,

took charge of them. The king sent a second message, to announce the dissolution of parliament; the messenger found the doors locked on the inside, and could not gain admittance. Maddened with rage, Charles summoned the captain of his guards, and ordered him to go and force open the doors. But in the interval, the commons had retired, after having declared the levying of tonnage and poundage illegal, and whosoever should pay or levy them, guilty of high treason [t].

All accommodation was impossible: the king went to the house of lords [u]. "Never," said he, "did I come here on a more unpleasant occasion; I come to dissolve parliament, the seditious conduct of the lower house being the sole cause; I do not make this charge against all its members, I know there are some honest and loyal subjects among them, but a few vipers have deceived or oppressed them; I hope these evil doers will have their reward. For you, my lords, you may rely on the favour and protection that a good king owes to his faithful nobility [x]." A short time after the dissolution had been pronounced, a proclamation appeared, declaring, "That whereas, for several ill ends, the calling of a new parliament is spoken of; though his majesty has shown, by frequent meetings with his people, his love of the use of parliaments; yet the late abuse having, for the present, driven him unwillingly out of his course,

[t] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 487—491.
[u] March 10th, 1629.
[x] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 492.

it will be considered presumption for any one to prescribe to him any time for the calling of that assembly[y]."

Charles kept his promise, and now only thought of how he should govern alone.

[y] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 525.

HISTORY OF

THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION,

FROM THE ACCESSION OF CHARLES I.

BOOK THE SECOND.

1629—1640.

Nothing is so dangerous as to take a system of government as it were on trial, with the expectation that it may at any time be changed. Charles committed this fault. He had attempted to govern in concert with the parliament; but at the same time continually declared that if parliament was not submissive he would do without it. He now entered upon the career of despotism with the same thoughtlessness, believing that, after all, if necessity forced him to it, he could again return to parliaments.

His most able councillors were of the same opinion. Neither Charles nor any about him had conceived the project of abolishing for ever the ancient usages of England, or the great national council. Rather imprudent than audacious, rather insolent than obstinate, their words and actions went beyond their settled designs. The king, they thought, had shown himself kind and just

towards his people; he had allowed a great deal, granted a great deal. But nothing could satisfy the commons; they required the king to put himself under their guidance and tuition; this he could not do without ceasing to be king. When the king and parliament could not agree, it was the duty of parliament to give way; for sovereignty belonged to the king alone: Since the commons would not give up, he was driven to govern without them; the necessity was evident; sooner or later the people would become sensible of this, and then, when parliament should become more moderate, nothing would prevent the king from recalling it in case of need.

With still less foresight than the council, the court only saw in the dissolution a relief from trouble. In presence of the commons, the courtiers lived in a state of constraint; none of them dared to push boldly their fortune, nor visibly to enjoy their credit. The vexations of the sovereign interrupted the intrigues, and spread a gloom over the festivals of Whitehall. The king was care-worn, the queen intimidated. When parliament was dissolved, their uneasiness and restraint disappeared; frivolous grandeur reassumed its full brilliancy, and the secret ambition of every one was at liberty. The court wished for no more; and cared little that a revolution in the government must take place in order to satisfy them.

The people judged otherwise: the dissolution,

in their eyes, was a sure symptom of a deep-laid scheme, of a resolution to do away with parliaments. The commons were no sooner dissolved than, at Hampton Court, Whitehall, and wherever the court assembled, those who were papists in their hearts and those who were so openly—the servants and preachers of absolute power, men of intrigue and pleasure, the indifferent to all creeds—already congratulated one another on their triumph; whilst in the Tower, in the principal prisons of London and the counties, the defenders of public rights, treated at the same time with rigour and contempt, were confined and impeached for what they had said in the inviolable sanctuary of parliament[a]. They claimed their privilege to have their liberty upon finding bail; the judges hesitated to answer; but the king commanded the judges[b], and the requests of the prisoners were refused. In this trial their courage did not fail them; the greater number refused to own themselves guilty, and to pay the fines that were imposed upon them. They preferred remaining in prison. Sir John Elliot died there.

While this prosecution lasted, public anger increased daily, and was openly manifested. It was a sort of continuation of the vanquished and dispersed parliament, still struggling before the

[a] The members arrested were, Hollis, Sir Miles Hobart, Sir John Elliot, Sir Peter Hayman, Selden, Coriton, Long, Strode, and Valentine; State Trials, vol. iii. p. 235—335.

[b] In September, 1629; Old Parl. Hist. vol. viii. p. 374.

judges of the country, through the voice of its leaders. The firmness of the accused kept up the ardour of the people; they saw them pass and repass from the Tower to Westminster, and accompanied them with their acclamations and their cheers. The visible anxiety of the judges still gave them some expectations. It was said that all was lost; yet hope and fear still continued as much as in the midst of the struggle.

But these great trials ended. Frightened or seduced, some of the accused paid the fine; and, condemned to live at least ten miles from the royal residence, retired to conceal their weakness in the provinces. The noble perseverance of the others was buried in dungeons. The people, who saw and heard no more of them, became quiet, and ceased to interfere. Charles, meeting no longer with any opponents, thought himself master of the country from which he had just estranged himself. He hastened the peace with France[c] and Spain[d], and felt himself at last without rivals in his kingdom, or enemies abroad.

To govern, for a while, was easy. The citizens only thought of their private interests: no great debate, no warm excitement, agitated gentlemen in their county meetings, townsmen in their municipal assemblies, sailors in the ports, or apprentices in their shops. It was not that the nation vegetated in apathy; its activity had

[c] April 14th, 1629. [d] November 5th, 1630.

taken another course; one would have thought it had forgotten in industry the defeat of liberty. More haughty than ardent, the despotism of Charles did not much disturb it in this new state. He meditated no vast designs; he was content to enjoy with dignity his power and his rank. Peace relieved him from exacting any great sacrifice from the people; and the people gave themselves up to agriculture, commerce, and study, without the intervention of ambitious tyranny to disturb their efforts, or compromise their interests. The result was, that public prosperity rapidly advanced; order reigned among the citizens; and this regular and flourishing condition gave to power the appearance of wisdom, and to the country that of resignation [e].

It was near the throne and among its servants that the disturbances of government recommenced. As soon as the struggle between the king and the people appeared calmed, two parties began to dispute which should exercise despotic authority; the queen and the ministry were one, the court and the council the other.

For a short time after her arrival in England, the queen had expressed, without any disguise, the insipidity and dulness which she felt in the new country. Its religion, its language, its customs and institutions, every thing displeased her; she had even, just after their union, treated her husband with puerile insolence, and Charles,

[e] Clarendon's History of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 126, and following.

exasperated by the passionate explosion of her anger, had felt obliged to send back to the continent some of the followers whom she had brought over with her[f]. The pleasure of reigning could alone afford her a compensation for her absence from France; and she reckoned upon this enjoyment from the time that the parliament was got rid of. Lively and agreeable in disposition, she soon acquired over a young king of pure and virtuous principles, an ascendency to which he submitted with a sort of gratitude, as if gratified by her condescending to be happy near him. But the happiness of a domestic life, dear to the grave and serious mind of Charles, could not satisfy the light and restless character of Henrietta Maria; she wanted an acknowledged, haughty empire; the honour of knowing and ruling every thing; in short, that empire which a capricious woman loves to exercise. Round her rallied, on one side, the papists; on the other, the frivolous, the ambitious, the intriguing young courtiers, who had learned at Paris the secret of pleasing her. All professed that it was through her they hoped for success; the papists for their creed, the courtiers for their fortunes. It was in her household that the papists and the emissaries of Rome assembled to treat of their most secret hopes; and there her favourites displayed the notions, manners, and

[f] In July, 1626; see the elucidations and historical notes added to the Memoirs of Ludlow, vol. i. p. 437.

fashions of continental courts[g]. Every thing there was foreign, and at variance with the creed and customs of the country; and there, daily, were revealed projects and pretensions that could only be realised by illegal measures or abused favours. The queen took part in these intrigues, and her influence with the king gave them a promise of success; she even went so far as to beg him, in order to honour her, as she said, in the eyes of the people, to consult her on all occasions, and to do nothing without her consent. If the king refused any of her wishes, she angrily accused him of knowing neither how to love her nor how to reign. Charles, on these occasions, only considered how he could best abate her passion or sorrow, happy to find her solicitous for his interest or for his love.

The most servile councillors would scarcely have submitted to this capricious sway. Among Charles's ministers were two who were deficient neither in enlightened views or independence of spirit, and who, though devoted to his service, would scarcely give way to the caprices of a woman or the pretensions of courtiers.

In forsaking his party to become the servant of the king, Strafford[h] had not been called upon to sacrifice any very fixed principle, or basely to act against his conscience. Of an ardent and ambitious temper, he had been a patriot

[g] May's History of the Long Parliament.

[h] He was then still called Lord Wentworth, and was not created Earl of Strafford till the 12th of January, 1640.

from hatred to Buckingham, from a desire for glory, from a wish to display his talents and his powers, rather than from any deep or settled conviction. To act, to rise, to govern, was his aim, or rather the very nature of his disposition. Enlisted in the service of the crown, he was as jealous of its prerogative as he had been of the rights of liberty, and laboured for it with the same zeal, earnestness, and pride: not as an obsequious and frivolous courtier, but as an able though rude minister. Of a mind too vast to confine itself to domestic intrigues, and too proud and irritable to bend to the etiquette of court, he passionately devoted himself to business, braving all rivalry and breaking down all resistance; eager to spread and strengthen the royal authority, which had now become his own, but diligent at the same time in establishing order and repressing abuses, in overcoming such private interests as he judged illegal, and promoting such general interests as he did not think dangerous. Although a fiery despot, yet all love of country, of its prosperity, of its glory, was not extinct in his heart, and he saw very well upon what conditions, and by what means, absolute power must be obtained. His administration was arbitrary but powerful, consistent and laborious; whilst he disdained the rights of the people, he was anxiously employed for the public good; unpractised in daily abuses and useless irregularities, he was subduing to his will and to his views the great and the humble, the court and

the nation: such was the aim, such the character of Strafford's administration, and such that which he strove to stamp on the king's government.

The friend of Strafford, archbishop Laud[1], with fewer worldly passions, and a more disinterested ardour, brought the same dispositions and the same designs into the council. Severe in his conduct, simple in his life, he was alike fanatically devoted to power, whether he submitted to it or exercised it. To command and to punish was in his eyes to establish order; and order always seemed to him justice. In business he was indefatigable, but narrow, violent, and stern. At once incapable of balancing interests, or respecting rights, he rashly persecuted liberties as abuses; thwarting some by his rigid probity, others by his blind animosity, he was as rude and irritable with courtiers as with citizens; he sought no friendship; he neither foresaw nor could bear any resistance; he felt convinced, in short, that power is all-sufficient when in the right hands; and was constantly absorbed by some fixed notion, which took possession of him with the violence, the passion, and the authority of a duty.

Such counsellors were not unsuitable to the situation of Charles. Strangers to the court, they cared less for pleasing it than serving their master; and had neither the fastidious insolence, nor the empty pretensions of favourites. They

[1] Created archbishop of Canterbury in August 1633.

were persevering, bold, capable of business and self-devotion. The government of Ireland had not long been confided to Strafford, when that kingdom, which had till then been only an encumbrance to the crown, became a source of riches and strength. Public debts were paid; the revenue, which before had been gathered without system, and shamefully squandered, was regularly administered, and soon rose above the expenditure; the nobles no longer vexed the people with impunity, and aristocratic and religious factions no longer dared to libel each other. The army, which Strafford had found weak, without necessaries and without discipline, was recruited, well disciplined, well paid, and ceased to pillage the inhabitants. Under the protection of order, commerce flourished, manufactories were established, and agriculture improved. In short, Ireland was governed harshly, arbitrarily, and often even with odious violence; but yet, to the interest of general civilisation and royal power, instead of being, as it used to be, a prey to commissioners of the treasury, and to the dominion of an ignorant and selfish aristocracy [k].

Laud, invested in England, as far as civil affairs were concerned, with a less extended and yet no less concentrated authority than that of

[k] See in "Strafford's Letters and Despatches," vol. ii. p. 20, a letter addressed by Strafford to his intimate friend Christopher Wandesford, in which he himself describes the character of his administration.

Strafford in Ireland, pursued the same conduct though with less ability than his friend. As commissioner of the treasury, not only did he repress all unreasonable expenses, but applied himself to the right understanding of the various branches of the public revenue, in order to find out by what means it could be collected with least expense to the people. Odious extortions, serious abuses, had introduced themselves into the administration of the custom duties, to the profit of private interests. Laud listened to the statements of merchants, employed his leisure in conversing with them, gained a knowledge of the general interests of commerce, and freed it from many vexations which existed without any advantage to the exchequer[1]. The office of high treasurer was soon afterwards, 1636, given, at his intercession, to Juxon, bishop of London, a man of a moderate and active disposition, who repressed many disorders which were equally annoying to the crown and to the citizens. To serve, as he thought, the king and the church, Laud lent a hand in oppressing the people, and gave the most iniquitous advice; but where neither king nor church were concerned, he sought for what was just and right, and upheld it without fear of the consequences either to himself or others.

This administration, upright, diligent, but arbitrary, even tyrannical where necessary, and

[1] Memoirs of Clarendon, vol. i. p. 28—29.

refusing all responsibility, by no means satisfied the nation; while for the court, it was a great deal too much. Favourites may succeed there; if they meet with enemies, they also make partisans, and in this conflict of personal interests an able intriguer may successfully oppose those he serves to those whom he offends. Such had been Buckingham. But whoever would govern, whether by despotism or by the laws, for the common interests of the king and the people, must expect hatred from all courtiers. Against Strafford and Laud the court was quite as violent, and far more busy than the nation. When Strafford first appeared at Whitehall, a contemptuous smile welcomed the sudden elevation and rather rude manners of the country gentleman, known most especially for his opposition in parliament[m]. The austere manners, the theological pedantry, and inattentive bluntness of Laud, were no less disliked. Both these men were haughty, of by no means agreeable or affable manners; they disdained intrigues, advised economy, and talked of business and necessities which a court does not relish. The queen disliked them, as they disturbed her influence with the king; the higher nobles were jealous of their power; and after a very short time the whole court joined the people in run-

[m] Howell's Letters, No. 34, edit. of 1650; Strafford's Letters, vol. i. p. 79; Biographia Britannica, vol. vi. p. 4178, note K. art. Wentworth.

ning them down, and in outcries against their tyranny.

Charles did not forsake them; he trusted in their talents and their devotion to his service; for the profound piety of Laud he felt indeed a respect blended with affection. But though he retained them in his confidence in spite of the dislike of his courtiers, he could not oblige the court to submit to their government. Though of a serious turn of mind, and grave in his exterior deportment, he had neither sufficient depth of mind nor ability to understand the difficulties of absolute power, and the necessity of sacrificing every thing to it; so clear in his eyes were the rights of royalty, that he thought nothing ought to cost him an effort. In council he occupied himself regularly, and with attention, upon public affairs; but this duty once fulfilled, he thought little more about them; and he had much less consideration of the necessity of governing, than of the pleasure of reigning. The good or bad temper of the queen, the usages of the court, and the prerogatives of the officers of the household, appeared to him matters of importance, which the political interests of his crown could never make him forget. This occasioned his ministers petty but continual troubles, and these the king left them to bear as they could, thinking he did enough for them and for himself by retaining them in his employment. They were charged with the administration of absolute power, yet found themselves thwarted the moment they claimed

any domestic sacrifice, any measure opposed to the forms and rules of Whitehall. Whilst Strafford remained in Ireland he was worn out by explanations and apologies; from Dublin he had to contradict the reports continually spread against him in the palace; sometimes he had spoken lightly of the queen; some high family had complained of his haughtiness; all these idle accusations obliged him to enter into long justifications of his words, his manners, his character; and he did not even then always obtain an answer that quite destroyed the misgivings these obscure perils caused, and that enabled him to display without fear the authority which was yet left him [n].

Thus, notwithstanding the energy and zeal of his principal counsellors, notwithstanding the tranquil state of the country, notwithstanding the dignity of his manners and the high bearing of his speech, the king and his ministers were without strength and consideration. Assailed by domestic dissensions, governed alternately by contrary influences, sometimes arrogantly shaking off the yoke of the laws, sometimes yielding to the most frivolous obstacles, Charles governed without any settled plan; he constantly forgot his own designs. He had abandoned the cause of the protestants on the continent, and had even forbidden lord Scudmore, his ambassador at Paris, to attend divine service in the chapel of the re-

[n] Strafford's Letters and Despatches, vol. i. pp. 128, 138, 142, 144; vol. ii. pp. 42, 105, 126, etc.

formers, because it did not come near enough to the rites of the English church[o]; yet he allowed the marquis of Hamilton to raise in Scotland a body of six thousand men, and to serve at their head under the banners of Gustavus Adolphus[p], little thinking that he would be there fighting for the same principles and doctrine that were held by the puritans, and proscribed by the Church of England. Charles's faith in the reformed religion, such as Henry the Eighth and Elizabeth had left it, was sincere; and yet, either through his affection for his consort, through a spirit of moderation and justice, or else from a sort of instinct of what was best suited to absolute power, he often granted to the papists, not only a liberty contrary to the laws, but almost avowedly favoured them[q]. Archbishop Laud, as sincere as his master, wrote against the Church of Rome, even preached strongly against the worship in the queen's chapel, while at the same time he showed himself so favourable to the system of the Romish church, that the pope thought himself authorised to offer him a cardinal's hat[r]. In the conduct of civil affairs reigned the same indecision, the same inconsistency. No fixed plan was acknowledged and acted upon; the weight of authority was never pressed with vi-

[o] Neal's History of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 234, 8vo. edition, 1822.
[p] In 1631.
[q] Clarendon's Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 254.
[r] In August, 1633; Laud's Diary, p. 49.

gour. Despotism was fastidiously displayed, and occasionally exercised with rigour; but to establish it, required many more efforts than Charles could make, much more perseverance than he could exercise. It was not even thought of, so that the king's claims daily more and more surpassed his means. The treasury was conducted with order and probity; the king was not prodigal; yet his want of money was as great as that which prodigality and a badly managed treasury might have brought on; the same haughtiness with which he had refused to give way to parliament, to obtain an income sufficient for his expenses, led him to think he should lower himself by reducing his expenses to a level with his income*. The splendour of the throne, the gaieties of the court, the old customs of the crown, were in his eyes the conditions, rights, almost the duties of royalty; sometimes he was ignorant of the abuses that were practised to provide for them, and when he did know them, he had not the courage to reform them. Thus, though peace saved him from any extraordinary expense, he still found himself unable to answer the wants of his government. English commerce prospered; merchant vessels daily grow-

* The pensions, which, under the reign of Elizabeth, were £18,000 rose under James I. to £80,000; and in 1626, a little more than a year after the accession of Charles I., they already amounted to £120,000. The expense of the king's house in the same interval had increased from £45,000 to £80,000; that of the wardrobe was doubled; that of the privy purse tripled, etc. Rushworth, vol. i. p. 207.

ing more numerous and more active, required the protection of the royal navy. Charles confidently promised it, sometimes he even made serious efforts to keep his promise[t]; but the fleet was in no condition to afford sufficient convoys for the merchantmen; the vessels needed rigging, the sailors had no pay. The pirates of Barbary ventured even to cruise in the straits of Dover; they infested the shores of Great Britain, landed, pillaged villages, and carried off thousands of captives. When at length, captain Rainsborough was sent with an expedition to the coast of Morocco to destroy one of their forts, he found there three hundred and seventy slaves, all English and Irish; and such was the impotency or the improvidence of the administration, that Strafford was obliged to arm a ship at his own expense to preserve the very port of Dublin from the depredations of these sea robbers[u].

So much incapacity, and the perils to which it was likely to lead, did not escape the observation of enlightened men. Foreign ministers, who resided in London, wrote of it to their masters; and soon, notwithstanding the well-known prosperity that reigned in England, the weakness, imprudence, and tottering state of Charles's government became the common talk of every

[t] Warwick's Memoirs. Rushworth, part 2. vol. i. pp. 257, 322, etc.

[u] Strafford's Letters and Despatches, vol. i. pp. 68, 87, 90; vol. ii. pp. 86, 115, 116, etc. Waller's Poems (8vo. London, 1730), p. 271. Captain Rainsborough's expedition took place in 1637.

court in Europe. In Paris, Madrid, and the Hague, his ambassadors were more than once treated with contempt [x]. Strafford, Laud, and a few other counsellors were not ignorant of the evil, and sought some remedy for it. Strafford, in particular, the boldest as well as most able, struggled with much perseverance against all obstacles; he was anxious for the future, and wished the king to govern his affairs with diligence and foresight, to secure to himself a fixed revenue, well-stored arsenals, fortified places, and an army [y]. He had ventured on his own account to assemble the Irish parliament [z]; and, either through the fear with which he inspired it, or the services he had rendered the country, he had made it the most obedient as well as the most useful instrument of his power. But Charles forbade him to call another [a]; the queen and he both dreading the very name of parliament. Thus the fears of his master prevented Strafford from giving to tyranny the forms and support of the law. He insisted strenuously, but without success, on this point, and at last

[x] The writings of that time show many examples of this; I shall only quote one, when Sir Thomas Edmonds went to France, in 1629, to conclude the treaty for peace, the gentleman sent to St. Denis to meet him and preside at his entrance, said to him, in a tone of derision: "Your Excellency will not be astonished that I have so few gentlemen with me, to pay you honour and accompany you to court; there were so many killed in the isle of Rhé," a bitter irony, alluding to Buckingham's defeat in that island. Howell's Letters, 1705.

[y] Strafford's Letters, vol. ii. pp. 61, 62, 66.

[z] In 1634.

[a] Strafford's Letters, etc. vol. i. p. 365.

was forced to give it up. Full of energy he bore the yoke of weakness, and his foresight was lost in the service of the blind. A few in the council who thought like him, but more selfish or better informed of the vanity of his efforts, withdrew when the time of trial came, and left Laud and him exposed to the intrigues and hatred of the court.

Tyranny thus frivolous and unsupported by talent daily needs new tyranny. That of Charles was, if not the most cruel, at least the most unjust and despotic that England had ever endured. Without being able to allege for excuse any public necessity, without dazzling the people's minds by any great event,—to satisfy obscure wants, to gratify a whim,—he misunderstood and trespassed on the ancient rights and opposed the present wishes of the nation; setting at defiance both the laws and opinions of the country, disregarding even his own promises, he hazarded upon one occasion or another every species of oppression; adopting, in short, the most violent resolutions, the most illegal measures, and all this not to secure the triumph of a consistent and formidable system, but to maintain by daily expedients an authority never free from embarrassment. Subtle counsellors were for ever rummaging among old records to discover a precedent for some forgotten iniquity, laboriously bringing to light the abuses of past times, and erecting them into rights of the crown. Other agents, not so erudite, but bolder, im-

mediately converted these pretended rights into real and new vexations; and when any claim was put forward, there was no lack of servile judges to declare that the crown had of old possessed it. Was the compliance of the judges at all doubted, the court of exception, the star chamber, the council of York[b], and a number of other tribunals, set above the common law, were charged to take their place: illegal magistrates becoming the accomplices and abettors of tyranny where legal magistrates were not sufficient for its purpose. Thus impositions were re-established that had long been out of use; and others, till then unknown, invented; thus reappeared those innumerable monopolies, introduced and abandoned by Elizabeth, recalled and also given up by James, constantly repelled by parliament, and at one time abolished by Charles himself, which gave to the farmer of the king's revenues, or to his privileged courtiers, the exclusive sale of almost every commodity; imposing new hardships upon the people, and irritating them still more by the unjust subdivision of their profits[c]. The extension of the royal forests, an

[b] Instituted by Henry VIII. at York, in 1537, in consequence of the troubles which broke out in the north upon the suppression of the lesser monasteries, its object being to administer justice and maintain order in the northern counties independent of the court at Westminster. Its jurisdiction, which at first was very confined, became arbitrary and much extended under James I. and Charles.

[c] The following is a list, though an incomplete one, of the wares then monopolized; salt, soap, coals, iron, wine, leather, starch, feathers, cards and dice, beaver, lace, tobacco, barrels, beer, distilled liquors, the poundage of hay and straw in London and Westminster,

abuse that had so often driven the barons of old to arms, became so rapid that the forest of Rockingham alone was increased from six to sixty miles in circumference, while the smallest encroachments on the part of the citizens were noticed and punished by exorbitant fines[d]. Commissioners went about the country questioning the rights of the possessors of ancient domains that had formerly belonged to the crown; in some places, the rate of emoluments attached to certain offices, in others the right of citizens to build new houses, or that of agriculturists to change arable land into meadows, was disputed; their object indeed was not to reform abuses but to sell their continuation at a high price[e]. Privileges, disorders of all kinds, were, between the king and those who transacted them, the sources of continual and shameful bargains. The severity of judges was even made a means of traffic; under the least pretext fines were imposed of an exorbitant amount, striking terror into those whom the fear of similar trials might threaten, and deciding them to rescue themselves beforehand by dint of money. One would

red herrings, butter, potash, linen cloth, paper, rags, hops, buttons, catgut, spectacles, combs, saltpetre, gunpowder, etc.

[d] Lord Salisbury was condemned to be fined for this motive £20,000; lord Westmoreland, £19,000; Sir Christopher Hatton, £12,000; lord Newport, £3,000; Sir Lewis Walton, £4,000, etc. etc. See Strafford's Letters, vol. ii. p. 117; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 642.

[e] May, Hist. of the Long Parl. vol. i. p. 43, of the *Collection*; Rushworth, part 2, vol. ii. p. 915, etc.

have thought the tribunals had no other business than to provide for the wants of the king and to ruin the adversaries of his power. If discontent appeared too general in any of the counties for such proceedings to be easily practicable, its provincial militia were disarmed and troops sent thither, whom the inhabitants were not only bound to keep and provide for, but moreover to equip. A person was put in prison for not having paid that which was not due; upon leaving it, a part was paid, more or less, according to the fortune, credit, or trade of the individual thus persecuted. Impositions, imprisonments, judgments, rigours and favours, all daily increased and were exercised in the most arbitrary manner—on the rich, because there was profit; on the poor because there was no danger[f]. At last, when complaints grew so loud that the court took alarm, the same magistrates, who had been the cause of them, purchased impunity for their injustice. In an excess of mad despotism, Strafford had caused lord Mountnorris, for a few inconsiderate words, to be condemned to death: and, though this judgment had not been carried into execution, the account of the prosecution caused a universal outcry against him in Ireland, in England, and even in the king's council. To quell it, Strafford sent to London six thousand pounds, to be distributed among the principal

[f] The sum total of the fines imposed during this epoch for the king's profit, is found to amount to more than six millions of money. See the Historical documents at the end of this vol.

councillors. "I have taken a more direct means," answered lord Cottington, an old and crafty courtier, to whom Strafford had entrusted the money, "I have given the money to him who could really transact the business, that is, to the king himself;" and Strafford obtained at this price, not only exemption from all procedure, but the permission to distribute at his own liking among his favourites, the property of the man whom he had caused to be condemned[g].

Such was the effect of Charles's necessities; his fears carried him much further. Notwithstanding his haughty bearing and seeming carelessness, he frequently felt his weakness and sought for support. He made some attempts to give back to the higher aristocracy the strength they had lost. Under the pretence of preventing prodigality, country gentlemen were ordered to live on their estates; their influence was feared in London[h]. The star chamber took under its care the consideration due to the nobility. An inadvertency, a want of respect, a joke, the least action in which the superiority of their rank and rights was not attended to, was punished with extreme rigour, and always by enormous fines to the benefit of the king and the complainant[i]. The aim was to make the

[g] Strafford's Letters and Despatches, vol. i. pp. 508, 511, 512.

[h] More than two hundred gentlemen were proceeded against in one day (March 20th, 1635) for having disobeyed this injunction. Rushworth, part 2, vol. i. p. 288, etc.

[i] A man named Granville was condemned to a fine of £4,000, and as much in damages to the profit of lord Suffolk for having said

nobility powerful and respected; but the attempts to make them so were not followed up, either because they were found ineffectual, or because the king, remembering the ancient barons, still entertained a dread of their descendants. In fact, some already took the part of the malcontents, and such alone were respected by the people. Simple gentlemen were still occasionally humiliated before the lords of the realm; but it was necessary to seek elsewhere a body, who, already powerful in themselves, would yet stand in need of assistance from the crown, and serve as a support to that absolute power of which they would partake. For a long time the English clergy had solicited this mission, they were now called to fulfil it.

The Anglican church, in its origin being founded upon the will of the temporal sovereign alone, had lost all its independence; it had no longer a divine mission, it existed no longer by its own authority. Strangers to the people, who did not elect them, divided from the pope and the universal church, formerly their support, the bishops and the superior clergy were appointed by the king, and were nothing more than his chief servants; a situation by no means proper for a body charged to represent what is most independent and elevated in the nature of man—faith.

of him that he was a base lord; Pettager was fined £2,000, and to be flogged for having held the same speech on Kingston. Rushworth, part 2. vol. ii. Append. pp. 43, 72; see also Clarendon's Memoirs.

The English church was soon aware of this defect in its constitution; but the perils to which it was exposed, and the high hand with which Henry VIII. and afterwards Elizabeth carried matters, had given it no chance of redress. Attacked at once by the papists and the nonconformists, still wavering in its possessions and doctrines, the church devoted itself without restriction to the service of temporal power, acknowledging its own dependence, and yielding to the absolute supremacy of the throne, which could now alone save it from the perils by which it was surrounded.

Towards the end of the reign of Elizabeth, a few and isolated symptoms announced rather higher pretensions on the part of the clergy. Dr. Bancroft, chaplain to the archbishop of Canterbury, maintained that episcopacy was not a human institution, that it had been from the time of the apostles the government of the church and that bishops held their rights not from a temporal sovereign, but from God alone[k]. This new clergy began now to think its power established, and took this first step towards independence; but the attempt, hazarded with fear, was haughtily repressed. Elizabeth would give up no part of her spiritual supremacy, and gave the bishops to understand that they possessed nothing but through her will. The archbishop of Canterbury himself only ventured to say that he wished the

[k] In a sermon preached the 12th of January, 1588; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i. p. 395.

doctor was in the right, but that he did not dare to hope so[l]. The people, who were only anxious to carry on the work of reform, ardently embraced the side of the queen, convinced, that the desire of the bishops for independence was not to free religion from temporal authority, but to obtain the power to oppress them in its name.

No decisive step was taken under James I. cunning and selfish, that monarch cared little about aggravating the evil, provided he escaped the peril. He maintained his supremacy, but granted so much favour to the bishops, and took so much care to strengthen their power, by his rude treatment of their enemies, that their confidence and strength were daily augmented. Zealous in proclaiming the divine right of the throne, they soon began to speak of their own; the opinions which Bancroft had timidly insinuated, all the upper clergy now openly avowed; maintained by numerous writings, and preached in every church. Bancroft himself was created archbishop of Canterbury[m]. As often as the king displayed his prerogative, the clergy bowed to it with respect, but these acts of momentary humility were no sooner over than they renewed all their old pretensions; making use of all their authority against the people, and devoting themselves more and more to the cause of absolute power, looking forward to the time when they should become so necessary to it, that it would be

[l] Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i. p. 397.

[m] In December, 1604.

forced to acknowledge their independence to make sure of their aid.

When Charles and the parliament were separated, and he stood alone in the midst of his kingdom seeking on all sides the means of governing, the clergy believed this time was come. They had recovered immense wealth, and enjoyed it without dispute. The papists no longer inspired them with alarm. The primate of the church, Laud, possessed the entire confidence of the king, and alone directed all ecclesiastical affairs. Among the other ministers, none, as lord Burleigh had done under Elizabeth, professed to fear and struggle against the encroachments of the clergy. The courtiers were indifferent or secretly papists. The character of the church was exalted by the great abilities of some of its members. The universities, that of Oxford in particular, were devoted to her maxims. Only one adversary remained, it was the people, daily more and more dissatisfied with the little reform that had taken place, and more and more desirous of its extension. But this adversary was also the adversary of the throne; claiming at the same time civil and religious liberty, the one as a guarantee for the other. The same peril threatened the sovereignty of the crown and of the episcopacy. The king, sincerely pious, seemed willing to admit that he was not the only one who derived authority from God, and that the power of the bishops was of no meaner origin and no less sacred than his own. Never

had so many favourable circumstances before united to enable the clergy to establish their independence of the crown, their dominion over the people.

Laud set himself to work with his accustomed vigour. First, all dissensions in the church must be quelled and a strict uniformity strengthen its doctrines and its discipline. He did every thing to accomplish this design. Power was exclusively concentrated in the hands of the bishops. The court of high commission, where every thing relating to religious matters was taken cognizance of and decided, became daily more arbitrary and inflexible in its jurisdiction and its forms, and more severe in the punishments it inflicted. The complete adoption of the Anglican canons, the minute observance of the liturgy, and the rites performed in cathedrals, were rigorously commanded to all ecclesiastics. Such cures has had been given to nonconformists were taken from them. The people crowded to hear them preach; they were denied the use of the pulpit[n]. Driven from their churches, deprived of their revenues, wandering from town to town, teaching and preaching to those individuals who, in a field, a tavern, or a private house, would assemble around them—persecution followed and reached them everywhere. Among the nobility at their country seats, among citizens, and rich families devoted to their mode of

[n] Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 179, etc.

faith, they were taken as chaplains or as tutors for their children; but persecution penetrated even into the bosom of families, and the chaplains and tutors of their choice were driven from them[o]. Such as were proscribed left England, went to France, Holland, or Germany, and founded churches in accordance with their faith; despotism pursued them beyond the sea, and summoned them to conform themselves to the Anglican rites[p]. French, Dutch, and German mechanics had brought their industry into England, and obtained charters which guaranteed to them the free exercise of their religion; these charters were taken from them; most of them returned to their native countries; the diocese of Norwich alone lost three thousand of these useful strangers[q]. Thus bereaved of every asylum, thus deprived of all employment, compelled to secret themselves or become fugitives, the nonconformists still continued to write in support of their doctrines; new books were prohibited and old ones suppressed[r]. It was even absolutely forbidden, either in the pulpit or elsewhere, to hold any discourse on the controverted points respecting which the minds of the people were

[o] Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 179, etc.

[p] Ibid. p. 205.

[q] Rushworth, part 2, vol. i. p. 272; May, Hist. of the Long Parl. vol. i. p. 161; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 232.

[r] The decree of the star chamber, July 11th, 1637; Rushworth, part 2, vol. ii. Appendix, p. 306; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 165.

most agitated[s]; for a general and grave controversy prevailed, not only on points of theology, but also, on discipline, on the mysteries of human destiny, and on the forms of public worship; and the Anglican church would neither tolerate any departure from its ceremonies, nor allow any discussion of its doctrines. The people were grieved that they could no longer hear the sermons of the men they loved, nor the discussion of the things that most occupied their thoughts. To calm these alarms and not to be entirely separated from their flock, moderate or timid nonconformists partly submitted, only claiming for themselves some trifling concessions, such as to be allowed to officiate without wearing a surplice, and to celebrate the Lord's supper without placing the communion table in the form of an altar. Sometimes the answer to their request was, that the form required was important and that they must obey; at others that it was insignificant and that they ought to yield. Driven to extremity, they absolutely resisted and insult as well as condemnation awaited them in the ecclesiastical courts. The epithets of fools, idiots, malapert, etc., a command to be silent the moment they attempted to speak in their own defence, was the treatment they generally received from the judges or the bishops[t].

[s] Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 163.

[t] Rushworth, part 2, vol. i. pp. 233, 240; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. i. p. 256, in the note, p. 352.

If they even renounced preaching, writing, and all public interference, tyranny did not give up its pursuit, but seemed to employ towards them a subtlety of persecution that no prudence could foresee, no submission turn aside. Mr. Workman, a minister of Gloucester, had maintained that pictures and ornaments in churches were remains of idolatry; he was thrown into prison. Some time before, the town of Gloucester had granted him for life the sum of twenty pounds a-year; the annuity was recalled, and the mayor and municipal officers impeached and condemned to a fine of great amount. When released from confinement, Workman opened a little school; Laud caused it to be put down. To earn his daily bread, the unfortunate minister practised as a physician; Laud forbade him to exercise this calling, as he had forbidden him to teach. Workman was struck with insanity, and soon died [u].

In these churches, deprived of their ministers, the pomp of catholic worship was restored; though persecution kept away the congregation, a profuse magnificence adorned the walls. Churches were consecrated with pomp [x], and force was afterwards employed to compel the people to attend. Laud was fond of prescribing minutely the details of new ceremonies, sometimes borrowed from the Romish church, and sometimes invented by his own

[u] Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 204. [x] Ibid. p. 290.

ostentatious yet narrow imagination. The least innovation, the least deviation of the nonconformists from the canons or the liturgy, was punished as a crime; Laud innovated without consulting any body, generally with the king's consent, but sometimes upon his own authority[y]. He changed the interior arrangement of churches, the forms of worship, imperiously prescribed customs till then unknown, even altered the liturgy which many parliaments had sanctioned, the result, if not the aim of all these changes being to render the Anglican church more conformable to that of Rome.

The liberty the papists enjoyed, and the hopes they imprudently or designedly expressed, confirmed the people in their worst apprehensions. Books were published to prove that the doctrine of the English bishops might very well agree with that of Rome; and these books, though not allowed, were dedicated to Laud or to the king, and openly tolerated[z]. Theologians, friends of Laud, bishop Montague, Dr. Cosens, and others, professed similar maxims without danger; while the preachers whom the people loved, in vain exhausted, alternately, courage and compliance to retain some little freedom to preach and write. The belief that popery would prevail daily increased both at court and among the people. The duke of Devonshire's daughter having embraced the Roman catholic faith, Laud

[y] Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 220.

[z] Whitelocke, Memorials, etc. p. 21.

asked her what reasons had determined her: "'Tis chiefly," said she, "because I hate to travel in a crowd; and as I perceive your grace and many others are making haste to Rome, I wish to get there first, to prevent my being jostled."

When Laud had firmly established, as he flattered himself, the splendour and exclusive dominion of episcopacy, he next endeavoured to secure its independence. One might have thought that in this he would not have found the king so obedient to his counsels; but it proved otherwise. The divine right of the bishops not only became, in a short time, the official doctrine of the upper clergy, but also that of the king himself. Dr. Hall, bishop of Exeter, set it forth in a treatise which Laud took care to revise, and from which he expelled every vague or timid sentence, and every appearance of doubt or concession[a]. From books this doctrine passed into deeds. The bishops no longer held their ecclesiastical courts in the name and as a delegation from the king, but in their own name; the episcopal seal alone was affixed to their acts; they required from the directors of manufactories a positive oath; and it was declared that the superintendence of universities belonged by right to the metropolitans[b]. The supremacy of the king was not formally abolished, but one would have thought it only remained to serve as a veil to the usurpations that were to

[a] Neal, History of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 292.
[b] Ibid. p. 244; Whitelocke, p. 22.

destroy it. While thus, freeing herself by degrees from all temporal restraint, the church made sundry encroachments in the administration of civil affairs; her jurisdiction was enlarged at the expense of the ordinary tribunals, and never before had so many ecclesiastics had a seat in the king's council, or held so many great offices in the state. Sometimes those who were threatened in their personal interests, rose against these encroachments; but Charles paid no attention to them; and such was the confidence of Laud, that when he gave the wand of high treasurer to Juxon, he exclaimed, in the transport of his joy, "Now, if the church will not uphold herself, I can do no more[c]."

When things had been brought to this pass, it was not the people alone that were irritated. The principal nobles, at least some of them, took the alarm[d]. They saw in these proceedings much more than tyranny; it was a real revolution, which, not satisfied with crushing popular reforms, compromised and destroyed the very essence of the first reformation: that which kings had made and the nobles adopted. The latter had learned to proclaim the supremacy and divine right of the throne, which, at least, freed them from any other empire; now, in addition, they were called upon to acknowledge the divine right of bishops, and to bow down

[c] Laud's Diary, pp. 51, 53, under the date of the 6th of March, 1636.

[d] Neal, History of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 250.

again before that church in whose subjugation they had rejoiced, and by whose spoils they had been enriched. Servility was exacted from them, for tyranny is always more jealous of its prerogatives than liberty of her rights; and those who had been their inferiors were allowed to assume independence. They felt themselves in peril for their rank, even for their possessions. The pride of the clergy was an offence which they had not for a long time been accustomed to; they heard people say, that the day was coming when a simple ecclesiastic would be as influential as the proudest nobleman in the kingdom[e]; they saw the bishops or their minions entrusted with all public offices, and loaded with the favours of the crown, the only compensation that remained to the nobles for the loss of their ancient splendour, liberties, and power. Charles, besides being sincerely devoted to the clergy, hoped to find in their elevation a firm defence against the turbulence of the people; hence the disposition to censure the conduct and to mistrust the designs of government soon became universal; discontent spread from the workshops of the city to the saloons of Whitehall: it prevailed in every class.

Among the higher ranks discontent showed itself by the disgust which they felt towards the court, and by a boldness of spirit hitherto unknown. Some of the most esteemed and in-

[e] Neal, History of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 251.

fluential nobles retired to their estates, in order to manifest their disapprobation by their absence. In London, and about the throne, a spirit of independence and examination penetrated into assemblies that were formerly servile or frivolous. Since the reign of Elizabeth, a taste for sciences and literature had no longer been the exclusive privilege of those who made it their profession; the society of distinguished men of letters, philosophers, poets, and artists, and the pleasures of refined conversation, were resorted to by the court as a new luxury, and by the aristocracy as a noble pastime. No feeling of opposition was blended with these associations; it was even the fashion, whether they were held in some famous tavern, or in the mansion of some lord, to ridicule the morose humour and the fanatical resistance of the puritans, for by that name this party were already known. Feasts, plays, literary conversation, an agreeable interchange of flattery and kindness, were the only aim of that society of which the throne was usually the centre and always the protector. All this was changed in the reign of Charles; the learned and the frivolous continued to meet together; but much graver subjects were discussed, and at a distance from that power to which they would have been offensive. Public affairs, moral sciences, religious dogmas and mysteries, were the subjects of conversation. The discussions were brilliant and animated, and eagerly sought for by such young men as having

returned, from their travels or studied in the Temple, sought to distinguish themselves; and indeed by all men of a serious and active mind whose rank allowed them leisure. In these Selden poured out the treasures of his erudition; Chillingworth revealed his doubts on matters of faith; lord Falkland, though young, opened his house to these philosophic debates, and his gardens were compared to those of the Academy[f]. Neither sects nor parties were formed therein, but free and vigorous opinions. They did not meet together, however, with any particular interest or design; but, attracted by the mere pleasure which a community of ideas afford, and stimulating each other to noble and elevated sentiments, they debated without constraint, and sought only to find and give currency to truth and justice. Some, devoted more than others to philosophical meditations, bent their minds to the consideration of what form of government most respected the dignity of man: others, followers of the law, allowed not the least illegal act of the king or his council to pass by unnoticed; others, theologians by taste or profession, deeply investigated the practice of the first ages of Christianity, its creeds, its forms and discipline, and compared them with the church which Laud seemed determined to establish. These men were united by no common perils, by no common passions, nor by any very clearly defined principles; but they all agreed

[f] Clarendon's Memoirs.

and mutually excited each other to detest tyranny, to despise the court, to mourn for parliaments, in short, to desire a reform which they could scarcely hope for, but in which every one anticipated individually the end of all his troubles, and the accomplishment of his wishes.

More distant from court, among a class of men less refined, and minds less cultivated, harsher feelings prevailed, and ideas much narrower, but at the same time more decided. Among these, opinions were connected with interests, and passions with opinions. Among the lower class of gentry and freeholders, a strong sentiment of anger was more particularly kindled against political tyranny. The downfal of the higher aristocracy, and of feudal government, had almost done away with the distinctions of rank among gentlemen; they all regarded themselves as the descendants of the conquerors of the great Charter; and felt indignant at seeing their rights, their persons, their possessions, given up to the will and pleasure of the king and his courtiers, while their ancestors had of old made war upon, and dictated laws to the sovereign. No philosophical theory, no learned distinction between aristocracy, democracy, and royalty, occupied their thoughts; the house of commons engrossed their whole attention, as representing, in their eyes, the nobles as well as the people, the ancient coalition of the barons as well as the nation at large: the house of commons alone had of late defended public liberties, and was

now alone capable of regaining them: it was the lower house alone that was thought of when parliament was mentioned; and the lawfulness as well as the necessity of its being all-powerful was a maxim that established itself by degrees in every mind. As regarded the church, but few country gentlemen had any systematic views either as respected its form or its government: they had no hostility to episcopacy; but they hated the bishops as the peculiar abettors and upholders of tyranny.

The reformation had proclaimed the freedom of civil society, and abolished the usurpations of spiritual power in temporal affairs. But the English clergy now seemed bent on regaining that power which the church of Rome had lost. The general feeling of the country gentlemen was altogether opposed to this ambitious design, though in other respects they did not disapprove of the government of bishops, provided the church neither pretended to political power nor divine right. All they desired was, that popery should have no inheritors, and that bishops, cut off from all share in the government of the state, should confine themselves to the religious affairs of their diocese as settled by law.

The complaints and designs of the better class of citizens, as well as of many of the lesser gentry and a great number of freeholders, went much further than this, particularly in religious affairs. Among these a passionate desire for reform was general; they were anxious to see

its great principles worked out; and felt a thorough hatred of every thing that retained any semblance to popery, or which merely recalled it to their memory. It was under the usurpations of the Roman hierarchy, said they, that the primitive church, the simplicity of its worship and the purity of its faith, had been destroyed. It was therefore the first object of the primitive reformers, of the new apostles, Zuinglius, Calvin, and Knox, to abolish this tyrannical fabric with all its idolatrous pomps. The gospel had been their rule, the primitive church their model. England alone persisted in walking in the ways of popery. The yoke imposed by the bishops was no less obdurate, their conduct no more holy, their pride no less arrogant than had been that of the Romish priests. Like them, their only aim was to acquire riches and power; like them, they disliked frequent sermons, austerity of manners, the liberty of prayer; like them, they pretended to subject to minute and immutable forms, the pious aspiration of the Christian's soul; like them, in short, they substituted the worldly pageantry of formal ceremonies for the vivifying words of Christ's holy gospel. On the sacred day of the sabbath did pious christians wish to perform their religious exercises in quiet and silence, their retirement was invaded by the noise of games and dancing, and by the riots of drunkenness in the streets and squares. And the bishops, not satisfied with merely allowing the people these profane pas-

times, even recommended them, nay, almost enforced them, lest the people should acquire a taste for more holy pleasures[g]. If they found in their flock a man whose timorous conscience disliked any of the formalities of the church, they imperiously imposed upon him the strictest observance of its minutest law; if they saw another attached to the laws, they tormented him with their innovations; they crushed the humble, and irritated the proud to revolt. On all sides, the usages, maxims, and pretensions of the enemies of the true faith, were supported. And why did they thus forsake the gospel? why this oppression of the most zealous christians? merely to maintain a power which the gospel conferred on no one, and which the first believers had never known. Let but episcopacy be abolished, and the church, returning to its primitive form, will be henceforth governed by ministers equal in rank, simple preachers of the gospel, who will by common consent and deliberation direct the discipline of christians; then we shall in truth be a church of Christ; then there will no longer be idolatry, or tyranny, and the reformation, at last completed, will no longer have to fear popery, which is even now at the door, ready to invade the house of God, which seems to be preparing for its reception[h].

When the people, in whose bosoms, from the

[g] Neal, History of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 919. Rushworth, part ii. vol. i. p. 191. 196.

[h] Rushworth, part iii. vol. i. p. 172—188.

first rise of the reformation, these ideas had been secretly fermenting, saw them adopted by a number of rich, eminent, and influential men; by men to whom they naturally looked for support and guidance, they acquired a confidence in them and in themselves, which, without at once breaking out into sedition, soon changed the whole condition and aspect of the country. Already in 1582, and in 1616, a few nonconformists formally separated themselves from the church of England, and formed, under the name of 'Brownists or Independents,' afterwards so celebrated, little dissenting sects, who denied any general government of the church, and proclaimed that every congregation of believers had the right to follow their own mode of worship upon purely republican principles[1]. From that epoch, several private congregations had been formed on this model, but they were neither numerous nor rich, and almost all as strange to the nation as to the church. Exposed when they were discovered, to persecution without any means of protection, these sects, in general, retired to Holland. But regret for their home soon struggled in their hearts as well as the desire for liberty; they sent messages to those friends whom they had left behind, begging them to join them in seeking a new home in those distant regions then almost unknown, but which at least belonged to England and where English people only dwelt. The

[1] Neal, Hist. of the Purit. part 3. vol. i. p. 172. 188; vol. ii. p. 43, 93.

most wealthy sold their possessions, bought a small vessel, provisions, implements of husbandry, and, conducted by a minister of the gospel, went to join their friends in Holland, in order to set out altogether for North America, where colonies were then forming. It seldom happened that the vessel was large enough to take so many passengers as were desirous of going. The parties being assembled on the sea side near the place where the vessel was at anchor, there, on the verge of the sands, the minister of that part of the congregation who were to remain behind preached a farewell sermon; and the one who accompanied the adventurers, answered him by another sermon; long did they pray together, and embrace each other for the last time; and while one party sailed away, the other returned sorrowfully, to await in a foreign land the means and opportunity of joining their brethren [k].

Several expeditions of this kind took place without obstacles being thrown in their way; the obscurity of the fugitives was their protection. But, all at once, in 1637, the king perceived that they had become frequent and numerous, that citizens of note engaged in them, and that they carried away with them great riches; it was said that twelve millions of money had already been thus taken out of the country [l]. It was no longer only a few weak and unknown sectarians who felt the oppression of tyranny; their opinions

[k] Neal, Hist. of the Purit. vol. ii. p. 110—112.
[l] Ibid. p. 186.

had spread, their feelings predominated even amongst those who did not embrace their doctrines. From different causes the government was so odious, that thousands of men differing in rank, and fortune, as well as in their objects, forsook their native land. An order of the council forbade these emigrations [m]. At that very time eight vessels ready to depart were anchored in the Thames: on board one of them were Pym, Haslerig, Hampden and Cromwell [n].

They did wrong to run from tyranny, for the people began to brave it. Fermentation had succeeded to discontent. Neither the re-establishment of legal order, nor even the abolition of episcopacy, were any longer the limits of people's thoughts. In the shadow of this great body who meditated this double reform grew up a crowd of various sects, more determined in their opposition and more bold in their opinions. On all sides, small congregations separated themselves from the church, founding their creed sometimes on the preversion or different interpretation of a text; sometimes on the rejection of a peculiar rite; sometimes on the destruction of all ecclesiastical government, the absolute independence of christians, and the sufficiency of the inspiration of the holy spirit for all their wants. Enthusiasm everywhere overcame fear. Notwithstanding the active inquisition of Laud, sects of all denomina-

[m] May 1st, 1637; Rushworth, part 2. vol. i. p. 409.

[n] Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 237.—Walpole, Catalogue of royal and noble authors, vol. i. p. 206, edit. 12mo. London, 1733.

tions assembled; in towns they found secrecy in cellars; in the country, under the roof of a barn, or in the midst of a wood. The loneliness and melancholy of the scene, the perils and difficulties which attended their meeting, all tended to warm the imagination both of preachers and hearers; they passed long hours together, often whole nights, praying, singing hymns, seeking the Lord, and cursing their enemies. Of little importance to the safety or even to the credit of these associations of fanatics was either the unreasonableness of their doctrines, or the small number of their partisans; they were sheltered and protected by the general resentment that had diffused itself through the country. In a short time the confidence of the nonconformists in public favour became so great, that, whatever their appellation, their creed, or their designs, they did not hesitate to distinguish themselves by their manners and their dress; thus openly professing their opinions before the eyes of their persecutors. Clothed in black, their hair cut close, and their heads covered with a wide brimmed, high crowned hat, they were everywhere as they passed the objects of respect to the multitude, who gave them the name of saints. Their credit augmented so much, notwithstanding the persecution they were exposed to, that even hypocrisy ranged itself on their side. Ruined merchants, workmen without employment, men shut out from society by their ill conduct, or overwhelmed with debts; whoever indeed wished to redeem his character with the

public, assumed the dress, air, and language of the saints, and immediately obtained, from a passionate credulity, welcome and protection [o]. In political matters the agitation, though less general and more orderly, daily extended. Among the inferior classes, either through their improved condition, or their religious creeds, ideas and wishes of equality till then unknown began to circulate. In a more elevated sphere, some proud and rugged minds, detesting the court, despising the impotency of the ancient laws, giving themselves up with enthusiasm to liberty of thought, dreamed in the solitude of their lectures, or in their private conversations, of more simple and efficacious institutions. Others, actuated by motives less pure, having faith in no creed, cynical in their conduct, and thrown by chance or inclination among the discontented, were well pleased at the prospect of general anarchy and disorder that would make way for their ambition, or at least free them from all restraint. Fanaticism and licentiousness, sincerity and hypocrisy, respect and contempt for old institutions, legitimate cravings, and unruly desires, all helped to excite the national anger, all united against a power whose tyranny inspired men of such different dispositions and opinions with the same hatred; while its weakness and want of prudence, gave activity and hope to the meanest factions, as well as the most audacious designs.

[o] Mrs. Hutchinson's Memoirs, vol. i. p. 164. 166, of M. Guizot's Collection.

For some time, the king and his council were ignorant of the progress of this public wrath; estranged from the nation, and meeting with no effectual resistance, they were still haughty and confident, notwithstanding all their perplexities. To justify their conduct, they often spoke in an exaggerated style of the bad spirit that was abroad, but their momentary fear did not awaken their prudence, and they at the same time dreaded and despised their enemies. Neither did the necessity which they were under, day after day, of increasing their acts of oppression enlighten them, but they gloried more and more in their strength as their growing perils obliged them to use more rigour.

In 1636, however, England swarmed with pamphlets against the favours granted to the papists, the disorders of the court, but, above all, against the tyranny of Laud and the bishops. The star chamber had already, more than once, severely punished such publications; yet never before had they been so numerous, so violent, and so ardently sought for by the people. Tracts were scattered in the streets of every town and country hamlet; smugglers were bold enough, for an immense profit, to import thousands from Holland; commentaries were made on them in churches, from which Laud had not been able entirely to eject the puritan preachers. Incensed at the insufficiency of their rigours, the council resolved to exercise new ones. A lawyer, a theologian, and a physician, Prynne, Burton,

and Bastwick, were summoned at the same time before the star chamber. At first it was intended to try them for high treason, in which case a capital punishment would have been awarded them; but the judges declared there were no means of straining the law so as to bring their offence under that indictment; consequently only a charge of petty treason, or felony was preferred against them.

The barbarous severity of the sentence was quite of a piece with the iniquity of the proceedings. The accused were called upon at a moment's warning, to make their defence; and their failure to do this they were told, would be taken as an acknowledgment of the facts. They answered that they could not write, as pens, ink, and paper had been denied them. These were sent to them, with an order that their pleadings must be signed by some counsellor, yet for several days all access to the prison was denied to the barrister they had chosen to conduct their case. At last, when suffered to visit them, he refused to sign their pleadings, lest he should compromise himself with the court; and no other would venture to do it. They asked for permission to sign their justification themselves. The court rejected their request, reasserting at the same time, that if a counsellor did not sign it, they should consider the offences of which they were accused as admitted and proved. "Your lordships," said Prynne, "ask for an impossibility." The court only renewed their declaration. The

proceedings begun by a gross insult. Four years before, Prynne had been condemned to have his ears cut off, for another pamphlet: "I thought," said lord Finch, looking at him, that Mr. Prynne had lost his ears; it seems to me he has still some left; and to satisfy the curiosity of the judges, a constable pushed back his hair, and discovered his mutilated ears. "I hope your lordships will take no offence," said Prynne, "but I only pray God that he may give you ears to hear me[p]."

The accused were condemned to the pillory, to lose their ears, to pay a fine of 5,000*l*, and to perpetual imprisonment. On the day the sentence was put in execution[q], an immense crowd assembled; the executioner was ordering them away: "Let them remain," said Burton, "they must learn to suffer;" the man was moved and did not insist[r]. "My dear Sir," said a woman to Burton, "this is the best sermon you ever preached."—"I hope so," he answered, "and may God convert the hearers[s]!" A young man turned pale, as he looked at him: "My son," said Burton to him, "Why art thou pale? my heart is not weak, and if I needed more strength, God would not let me want it[t]." The crowd drew nearer and nearer to the condemned: some one gave Bastwick a bunch of flowers, a bee came and pitched upon it: "See this poor little

[p] State Trials, vol. iij. col. 711—717.
[q] June 30th, 1637.
[r] State Trials, vol. iii. col. 751.
[s] Ibid. col. 753.
[t] Ibid. col. 752.

bee," said he, "even on the pillory it comes and sips honey from the flowers; and why should I not enjoy here the honey of Jesus Christ[u]."—Christians, "said Prynne," if we had prized our *own liberty*, we should not be here, it is for the liberty of you all that we have exposed our own: keep it well, I conjure you, remain firm, be true to the cause of God and your country; or else you and your children will fall into eternal servitude[x]." The air rang with acclamations.

A few months after[y], the same scenes were renewed about the scaffold of Lilburne, who suffered for the same cause a like cruel treatment. The enthusiasm of the sufferer and of the people seemed even still greater. Tied to a cart's tail and whipped through the streets of Westminster, Lilburne never ceased from exhorting the multitude that followed him. When bound to the pillory he continued to speak; he was ordered to be silent, but in vain; they stopped his mouth so as to prevent him. He then drew from his pockets pamphlets, which he threw to the people, who seized them with avidity; his hands were then tied. Silent and motionless, the crowd who had heard him remained to gaze upon him. Some of his judges were at a window to look at him, as if curious to behold how far his perseverance would go; he exhausted their curiosity[z].

[u] State Trials, vol. iii. col. 751. Ibid. col. 748.

[y] April 18th, 1638.

[z] State Trials, vol. iii. col. 1315, etc.

All this must be attributed solely to the sympathy of the people with those whom they regarded as martyr's to their cause. None of these sufferers were distinguished by name, talents, or fortune; several, before their trial, were of but little consideration in their profession; and the opinions they maintained were only those of a few fanatic sects, which had found favour with the multitude. Proud of their courage, the people soon accused the higher classes of weakness and apathy: "Honour," said they, "which usually dwells in the head, is now, like the gout, flown to the feet[a]." Such, however, was not the case: the country gentlemen and better class of citizens were no less irritated than the people; but more considerate and not so easily moved, they only waited for some great occasion, in which they might hope for success. But this public cry aroused them, and inspired them with confidence. In short, at this moment, the indignation of the whole kingdom was raised to the highest pitch, and nothing was wanted but a few intelligent and influential leaders who would resist, not as adventurers or sectaries, but as the representatives of the rights and interests of the country.

John Hampden[b], a gentleman of the county of Buckingham, gave the signal for this national

[a] A saying related in a letter of lord Haughton and Sir Thomas Wentworth, dated May 15th 1627. Strafford's Letters and Despatches, vol. i. p. 38.

[b] Born in London in 1594.

resistance. Others before him had attempted it in vain. Others had refused to pay the impost called *ship money*, hoping that the question might be brought before the judges, and solemnly argued as to its lawfulness or unlawfulness in the court of king's bench: but the court had hitherto always found means to elude this discussion [c]; Hampden forced it on. Though in 1626 and 1628 this patriot had sat in parliament on the benches of the opposition; he had not given any cause for suspicion to the court. Since the last dissolution of parliament, he had lived peaceably, sometimes on his estates, sometimes in travelling over England and Scotland, observing with attention the spirit and disposition of the people wherever he went, and contracting numerous connections; but no where expressing any discontent. Possessing a large fortune, he enjoyed it honourably, and without display; his manners were grave and simple, though without any manifestation of austerity, he was even remarkable for the affability and the serenity of his temper; he was respected by his neighbours of all parties, passing among them for a prudent sensible man, opposed to the present system, but neither fanatic nor factious. The magistrates of the county without fearing him, spared him. In 1636, in their assessment, they rated Hampden at twenty shillings, intending without doubt to let him off easy, and in hopes that the smallness of the rate would prevent a prudent man from

[c] Rushworth, part 2. vol. i. p. 323, 414, etc.

disputing it. Hampden, solely intent upon vindicating the rights of his country in his own person, calmly, and without any expression of anger, refused to pay: while in prison, his conduct was equally quiet and reserved; he only wished the case to be brought before the judges, and represented that the king was no less interested than himself in having such a question settled according to law. The king, proud of having recently obtained from the judges the declaration, that, in case of necessity, this tax might be legally imposed, was, at last, persuaded to allow Hampden the honour of bringing it to trial. The counsellors whom Hampden employed, supported his case with the same prudence that he[d] himself had shown; speaking of the king and his prerogative with the greatest respect, avoiding all declamation, all hazardous principles, they rested their case solely on the laws and usages and history of the country. One of them, Mr. Holborne, even interrupted himself several times, begging the court to forgive him the warmth into which his arguments led him, and to warn him if he passed the limits which law and decorum prescribed. The attorney and solicitor-general, themselves, gave Mr. Hampden credit for his moderation[e]. During the fourteen days that the trial lasted, notwithstanding the great excitement of the public, the fundamental laws of the

[d] February 14th, 1637. Rushworth, part 2, vol. i. p. 352—355. State Trials, vol. iii. col. 825.

[e] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 229.

country were solemnly debated, and no passionate reproof, nor even the suspicion of any seditious design could be imputed to these champions of public liberty [f].

Hampden was condemned [g]; only four judges voting in his favour [h]. The king rejoiced in this judgment, as the decisive triumph of arbitrary power. The people took the same view of it, and no longer hoped for redress either from the magistrates or the laws. Charles, however, had but little reason for exultation; the state of despair to which the people were reduced only lent new courage. Discontent, which had till now been incoherent and divided, became unanimous: gentlemen, citizens, farmers, tradespeople, presbyterians, sectarians, in short, the whole nation felt itself wounded by this decision [i].

Hampden's name was in every mouth; it was every where pronounced with pride and love, for his destiny was the type of that of his country, and his conduct its glory. The friends and par-

[f] State Trials, vol. iii. col. 846—1254.

[g] June 12th, 1637.

[h] Sir Humphry Davenport, Sir John Dunham, Sir Richard Hutton, and Sir George Cooke. Contrary to the general assertion, Mr. Lingard says that five judges declared in favour of Hampden. Hist. of England, vol. x. p. 33, 8vo. edit. London, 1825. His error evidently arises from his having reckoned for two voices, the two opinions given in favour of Hampden by Judge Cooke, which are both inserted in the trial. (State Trials, vol. iii. col. 1127—1181.) In 1645, the son of Judge Hutton was killed at Sherborne for the royal cause.

[i] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. viii. p. 117—120; May, Hist. of the Long Parl. Hocket, Life of Bishop Williams, part 2, p. 127.

tisans of the court scarcely dared to avow the legality of their victory. The judges excused themselves, almost confessing their cowardice, to obtain forgiveness. Peaceable citizens were sorrowfully silent; bolder spirits expressed their anger aloud and with secret satisfaction. Soon, both in London and the country, the discontented found leaders who met to talk of the future. Measures were every where taken to consult and uphold each other in case of necessity. In short, a party was formed, which, however, careful to hide itself, was publickly acknowledged by the nation. The king and his council were yet rejoicing over their triumph, when their adversaries found the means and occasion of more successfully opposing them.

About a month after Hampden's condemnation[k], a violent sedition broke out at Edinburgh, occasioned by the sudden and arbitrary introduction of a new liturgy. From the time of his accession, Charles, like his father, had continually laboured to overthrow the republican constitution which the Scottish church had borrowed from Calvinism, and to re-establish the Scottish episcopacy, a shadow of which still existed, in all its authority and pomp.

Fraud, violence, threats, corruption, every thing had been put in requisition to make this design succeed. Despotism had even shown itself patient and supple; sometimes addressing

[k] July 23rd, 1637.

itself to ecclesiastical ambition, sometimes to the interests of the small landed proprietors, offering to the latter an easy redemption of their tithes, and to the former high church dignities and honourable offices in the state, always advancing its own designs, yet with cautious, slow, and subtle steps. From time to time, as the people became alarmed and the national clergy resisted, their assemblies were dissolved, and their boldest preachers banished. Even the parliament, though always servile, sometimes hesitated; the elections were then thwarted, their debates suppressed, and even the votes falsified[l]. The Scottish church amid these contentions, which always proved of advantage to the crown, was gradually drawn under the yoke of a hierarchy and discipline very similar to that of the English church; which regarded as sacred the doctrines of absolute power, and the divine right of bishops and kings. In 1636 this work seemed all but completed; the bishops had recovered their jurisdiction; the archbishop of St. Andrew's was lord high chancellor[m], the bishop of Ross[n] was on the eve of becoming high treasurer; out of fourteen prelates, nine had seats in the privy council, which they ruled[o]. Charles and Laud thought it now time to put the finishing stroke to the

[l] Burnet's Hist. of his own Times; Malcolm Laing, Hist. of Scotland, etc. vol. iii. p. 110—112.

[m] Spottiswood. [n] Maxwell.

[o] Clarendon's Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 148—150; Malcolm Laing, Hist. of Scotland, vol. iii. p. 122.

whole, by imposing this church with new canons and a liturgy conformable to its present discipline, at once upon the people, without consulting either them or the clergy.

But the reformation in Scotland had not been brought about, as in England, by the will of the prince and the servility of the court. It began among the people, and had, by its own strength, and in spite of many obstacles, mounted to the throne instead of descending from it. No difference of system, situation, or interests had, from its first rise, divided its partisans; and in the course of a long struggle, they had learned as well how to brave authority, as to wield it. The Scottish preachers might already boast of having instigated the nation to take up arms, supported a civil war, dethroned their queen, and of having ruled their king till the day he left them for a foreign throne, and thus escaped from their dominion. Strong in their union and by the remembrance of past victories, they boldly mixed politics with religion in their discourses from the pulpit; and the affairs of the country, religious controversies, even censures of the conduct of the king's ministers by name, as well as of their parishioners, were introduced into their sermons. The people, by their example, had acquired the same audacity of mind and speech; taking to themselves the triumph of the reformation, they cherished it not only as their creed, but also as the work of their own hands. They held as a fundamental maxim the spiritual independence

of their church, not the religious supremacy of the monarch; and thought it was in their power, and certainly their duty, to protect against kings, bishops, and popes, that church which they had founded in opposition to them. The preponderancy given to their kings, by their elevation to the English throne, for a little while abated their courage; hence the success of James the First against those presbyterian doctrines and institutions, which, as king of Scotland alone, he would have been obliged to obey. Kings are easily deceived by the apparent servility of nations. Scotland was intimidated, Charles thought it was subdued. By his own supreme power and the aid of episcopacy, he had crushed in England the popular reformation which had always been successfully contested by his predecessors; he thought he could do the same in Scotland, where it had reigned, where alone it was legally constituted, where the supremacy of the throne was only acknowledged by the bishops whom *he* had lately reinstated, but who received no other support.

The attempt had that issue which has often caused the astonishment and sorrow of the servants of despotism; it failed just as it seemed on the point of being completely successful. The re-establishment of episcopacy, the abolition of ancient law, the suspension or corruption of political and religious assemblies, all that could be done without direct contact with popular feeling had been accomplished. But when, to

complete the work, it became necessary to change the form of public worship, on the very day of the first reading of the new liturgy in the cathedral of Edinburgh, every thing was overthrown. In a few weeks, a general and sudden insurrection brought to Edinburgh[p] from all parts of the kingdom, an immense multitude; landholders, farmers, citizens, tradesmen, peasants, all came to exclaim against the innovations with which their religious worship was threatened, and to maintain their claims by their presence. The houses and streets were crowded with them, they encamped at the gates and beneath the walls of the town, besieged the hall of the privy council, who vainly asked for help from the municipal council, itself besieged in the same manner, insulted the bishops as they passed, and in short, drew up in the public square an accusation of tyranny and idolatry against them, which priests, gentlemen, and even a few lords did not refuse to sign[q]. The king, without answering their complaints, ordered the petitioners to retire; they obeyed, less from submission than necessity; and returned about a month after more numerous than ever[r]. All this was done without riot or disorder, their passion was serious and silent; the upper classes had engaged in the quarrel; in a fortnight a

[p] October 18th, 1637; Rushworth, part 2, vol. i. p. 404, etc.

[q] Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 274; Malcolm Laing, History of Scotland, vol. iii. p. 136—138.

[r] November 15th, 1637.

regular plan of resistance was proposed, adopted, and put in action; a superior council, elected from the different ranks of citizens, was charged to carry on the general enterprise; in every county, in every town, councils subordinate to the church executed their instructions. Thus the insurrection had disappeared, but was ready to rise at a moment's notice, when summoned by the government it had chosen for itself.

Charles at last gave an answer[s]; but it was only to confirm the liturgy, and to forbid the petitioners to assemble under pain of being considered guilty of treason. The Scottish council were ordered to keep the royal proclamation secret, until the moment of its publication. But the leaders of the insurrection knew its contents even before they had received it. They immediately convoked the people to support their representations. The council, in order to be beforehand with them, caused the proclamation to be published without an instant's delay[t]. At that moment, and on the very footsteps of the king's heralds, two peers of the realm, lord Hume and lord Lindsay, caused a proclamation, which they had signed, to be proclaimed and placarded, in the name of their fellow-citizens. Others did the same in every place in which the king's proclamation was published. Becoming daily more agitated, more threatened, and more united, the insurgents at last resolved to bind themselves by

[s] December 7th, 1637; Rushworth, part 2, vol. i. p. 408.

[t] February 19th, 1638.

a solemn league and covenant, such as Scotland, since the breaking out of the reformation, had more than once adopted, in order to maintain and set forth their rights, their wishes, and their faith. Alexander Henderson, the most influential of the ecclesiastics, and Archibald Johnston, afterwards lord Wariston, then a celebrated counsellor, drew up this document, which was revised and approved of by the lords Balmerino, Lowden, and Rothes[u]. It contained besides a minute and already ancient profession of faith, the formal refusal of the new canons and liturgy, and a solemn oath of national union to protect the sovereign, religion, laws, and liberties of the country against all dangers. The covenant, as soon as it was proposed, was received with general transport. Messengers went from village to village, carrying it with wonderful rapidity to the most distant parts of the kingdom; as the fiery cross was borne over the mountains to call to war all the vassals of the same chieftain[x]. Gen-

[u] March 1st, 1638.

[x] When a chief wished to assemble his clan on any sudden and important occasion, he killed a goose, made a cross of some light wood, and set the four ends of it on fire and then extinguished them in the blood of the goose. This cross was called the *fiery cross*, or the cross of shame; because those who refused to obey this token, were declared infamous. The cross was given into the hands of a quick and trusty messenger, who ran rapidly to the nearest village or hamlet, and presented it to the first in the place, without uttering another word than the place of rendezvous; the receiver set off with like promptitude to the neighbouring village; it thus went, with almost incredible celerity, over the whole district dependent on the same chief; and those of his allies if the danger was common to them. At the sight of the fiery cross, every man from six-

tlemen, priests, citizens, labourers, women, children, all assembled in crowds to take the covenant. Even highlanders, stimulated by this national movement, forgot for a time their passionate loyalty and wild animosities, and joined the rest of the nation. In less than six weeks all Scotland was united by the solemn league and covenant: the few persons employed by government, two or three thousand Roman catholics, and the town of Aberdeen, alone refused to join it.

So much boldness astonished Charles; he had heard of the furious riots of a lawless multitude; the municipal council of Edinburgh had even solicited his clemency, promising the prompt chastisement of the factious; and his Scottish courtiers boasted daily that they found by their private correspondence, that all was quiet, or nearly so[y]. Incensed at the little respect paid to his wishes, he resolved to employ force; but nothing was ready, delay was inevitable. The marquis of Hamilton was sent to Scotland with orders to flatter the rebels with some hope, but without engaging the king or coming to any set-

teen to sixty, who was capable of bearing arms, was obliged to look out his best weapons and his best clothes, and to be at the place of rendezvous. Whoever was absent, was liable to have his lands devastated by fire and blood; a peril of which the fiery cross was the emblem. In the civil war of 1745, the fiery cross was often in circulation in Scotland; once, in particular, it travelled in three hours all over the district of Bredalbane, about thirty miles. This custom existed in most of the Scandinavian nations. [See canto iii. in Scott's Lady of the Lake.]

[y] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 192.

tlement. Twenty thousand covenanters, who were assembled at Edinburgh for a solemn fast, went to meet Hamilton[z], seven hundred priests, all dressed in their ecclesiastical robes, stood on an eminence by the road side, singing a psalm at the moment he went by[a]. This was done to give the marquis a high opinion of the strength of the party; and Hamilton, as well out of regard to his own credit, as to obey the instructions of his master, was inclined to be wary. But the concessions he proposed were deemed insufficient and deceitful; he attempted to oppose a royal covenant to the popular covenant, but it was rejected with derision. After several parleys and several journeys from Edinburgh to London, he suddenly received from the king orders to grant all the requests of the insurgents[b], to abolish the canons, liturgy, and the court of high commission, to promise that a religious assembly and a parliament should be called, in which all questions would be freely debated, and in which even the bishops might be impeached. The Scots rejoiced, but were still mistrustful; the more so from the care that was taken to abolish every pretext for their longer confederation. A general synod assembled at Glasgow[c]. They soon perceived that Hamilton only wanted to throw obstacles in their path, and to find out some flaw by which their

[z] In June, 1638.

[a] May, Hist. of the Long Parl. vol. i. pp. 85, 86, in the Collection.

[b] In September, 1638. [c] November 21st, 1638.

acts might be rendered void. Such, in fact, were the king's directions[d]. Yet the assembly proceeded, and were preparing to bring the bishops to trial, when Hamilton suddenly pronounced their dissolution[e]. At the same time they heard that Charles was preparing for war, and that a body of troops, levied in Ireland, by the marquis of Strafford, was on the point of embarking for Scotland[f]. Hamilton departed for London; the synod refused to disperse, and continued their deliberations, condemned all the royal innovations, maintained the covenant, and abolished episcopacy. Several lords, who till then had remained neuter, now embraced the cause of their country; among others was the earl of Argyle, a man of large property, and renowned for his prudence. Merchants sent out ships to procure from abroad arms and ammunition; a copy of the covenant was sent to the Scottish troops on the continent, and one of their best officers, Alexander Leslie, was invited to return, to take, if it were necessary, the command of the insurgents. Finally, a declaration, in the name of the Scottish people, was addressed to the English nation[g], to acquaint them with the just grievances of their brother christians, and to repel the calumnies of their enemies.

The declaration, at court, was received with

[d] See the notes and historical documents at the end of this vol.

[e] November 28th, 1636.

[f] Strafford's Letters and Despatches, vol. ii. pp. 233, 278, 279.

[g] February 27th, 1639.

irony; the insolence of the insurgents was laughed at; the only source of annoyance the courtiers alluded to was the having to fight against them; for what profit, what glory, could arise from war with a people so poor, vulgar, and obscure[h]. Though a Scot himself, Charles hoped that the old hatred and contempt of the English for the Scots would prevent their complaints taking any effect. But when the same creed unites nations, the lines that divide them are soon effaced. In the cause of the Scots, the malcontents in England plainly saw their own. A secret correspondence was rapidly established between the two kingdoms. The declarations of the insurgents were spread everywhere; their grievances, their doings, were the subject of popular conversation; in a short time, they obtained friends and agents in London, in the counties, in the army, and even at court. As soon as their resolution to resist was confirmed, and the opinion of the English people seemed to favour them, there were not wanting Scotch, and even English courtiers, who, to injure some rival, to take vengeance for some affront or favour refused, or to prepare against all chances, were ready to render them some secret services; sometimes by sending them information, sometimes by exaggerating their number, boasting of their discipline, and disquieting themselves about the dangers to which the king was exposed, and

[h] May, History of the Long Parl. vol. i. p. 96.

which a little complaisance could so easily prevent. The royal army, as it advanced towards Scotland, heard a thousand reports spread on purpose to intimidate them and prevent their progress; counsels were given to the earl of Essex, their general, to beware, to wait for reinforcements, as the enemy was much superior in number; they had been seen at such a place near the frontiers; they occupied all the strongholds, and even Berwick would be in their hands before they could arrive there. The earl, a precise and faithful officer, though but little favourable to the designs of court, continued his march, entered Berwick without obstacle, and soon found out that the troops of the insurgents were neither numerous nor well prepared. Yet these reports, as eagerly listened to as they were carefully spread, did not inspire the less fear in the minds of the soldiers[i]. This trouble increased upon the king's arrival at York[k]. Still infatuated with the irresistible ascendency of majesty, Charles went thither with extraordinary pomp; thinking perhaps a display of that would be sufficient to bring back the rebels to their duty. As if to balance the appeal of nation to nation, as made by Scotland to England, he appealed to the nobility of his kingdom, summoning them, according to the feudal custom, to come and give him on this occasion the service that they owed him.

[i] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 197.

[k] In April, 1639.

The lords and a crowd of gentlemen flocked to York as to a festival. The town and camp put on the appearance of a court and a tournament, rather than that of an army and preparations of war. Charles's vanity was delighted with this splendid retinue; but intrigue, disorder, and want of discipline were busy around him[l]. The Scots on the frontiers familiarly communicated with his soldiers. He wanted to exact from the lords an oath, that they would upon no pretext whatever keep up any connection with the rebels; but lord Brook and lord Say refused to take it; and Charles dared not show his resentment in any other manner than by banishing them from his presence. Lord Holland entered the Scottish territories; but on seeing a body of troops whom Leslie had artfully disposed, the earl, without much examination, computed their number to be much greater than his own, and withdrew with precipitation[m]. Commanders and soldiers, all hesitated to undertake a war which every one decried. The Scots, well informed of what passed, took advantage of this disposition. They wrote to the chiefs of the army, to the lords Essex, Arundel, and Holland, in moderate and flattering language, professing an entire confidence in the sentiments of the nobility as well as of the English people, and begging them to intercede in their behalf with the king that they might be

[l] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 199.

[m] Rushworth, part 2, vol. ii. p. 935.

restored to his favour[n]. Shortly after, certain of being supported, they addressed themselves to the king himself, with humble respect, but without in the least diminishing their claims[o]. Charles knew not what to do; without ardour himself, he was as quickly subdued by obstacles as he was short-sighted in seeing them. Conferences were held[p]; the king appeared haughty but in a hurry to conclude; the Scots were obstinate but nowise insolent. Charles's pride was gratified by the humility of their discourse; and on the 18th of June, 1639, with the consent of Laud, who, it is said, was himself much moved at the approach of danger, peace was concluded at Berwick: both armies were dispersed, a synod and Scotch parliament convoked, yet without any clear and precise treaty having been agreed upon which would lead to a settlement between the contending parties.

The war was only delayed, and this both parties equally foresaw. The Scots, in dispersing their troops, left in the hands of their officers an advance of pay, and ordered them to hold themselves in readiness[q]. Charles, on his side, had scarcely disbanded one army before he began secretly the levying of another. The peace had been concluded about a month, when he recalled Strafford from Ireland, to consult him, as he

[n] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 205.
[o] Rushworth, part 2, vol. ii. p. 938.
[p] June 11th, 1639, Rushworth, ibid. p. 940.
[q] Whitelocke, p. 29.

said, on some military plans; and he added, "I have other reasons, and too many reasons, for wishing to have you for a little while near me: in a letter I can only mention this: the Scottish covenant spreads too far, a great deal too far[r]." Strafford came with the utmost speed. It had long been his most ardent desire to be employed near his master, the only place in which he could hope for the glory and power his ambition coveted. He arrived, resolved to employ the whole of his energy against the adversaries of the crown; spoke with the greatest contempt of the Scots, and asserted that irresolution and weakness alone had caused every failure; yet at the same time expressed so much confidence in the firmness of the king, that he promised himself every thing from it. He found the court agitated by petty intrigues; the earl of Essex, notwithstanding his good conduct in the campaign, had been treated coldly, and had retired discontented; the officers mutually accused each other of incapacity and cowardice; the queen's favourites busily fomented the general discontent, in order to advance their own fortunes, and cause the downfal of their rivals; the king himself was low-spirited and cast down[s]. Strafford soon felt uneasy; he found it out of his power to enforce the adoption of all that he judged necessary, or to ensure the execution of what he had caused to be adopted. Courtiers soon plotted against

[r] Strafford's Letters and Despatches, vol. ii. p. 281, 372.

[s] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 214.

him. He could not prevent Sir Harry Vane, one of his personal enemies, from being, through the queen's influence, elevated to the rank of secretary of state[t]. The public, who, uncertain in what way he would use his influence, had anxiously watched his arrival, soon learnt that he advocated the most rigorous measures, and loaded him with maledictions[u]. Yet necessity was pressing. A debate had arisen between the king and the Scots on the purport of the treaty of Berwick, of which scarcely any thing had been reduced to writing; and Charles had caused a paper, which, in the opinion of the covenanters, contained the true conditions, to be burnt by the common hangman; he took care, however, to publish nothing himself in contradiction of their statement, for he knew that in negotiating he had permitted them to hope that which he never meant to accomplish[x]. Irritated by this want of candour, and advised by their English friends to be more on their guard than ever, the Scottish synod and parliament, far from abandoning any of their former pretensions, formed new and bolder designs. The parliament demanded that the king should engage to convoke them every three years, that freedom in elections and debates should be well secured; in short,

[t] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 216.

[u] May, Hist. of the Long Parl. vol. i. p. 105, in the Collection.

[x] Ibid.; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 214; Rushworth, part 2. vol. ii. p. 965.

that political liberty, sufficiently guaranteed, should watch over the interests of religion[y]. The words, 'attempt on the prerogative,' 'invaded sovereignty,' were now more frequently heard at court and in the council: "These people," said Strafford, "must be whipped back to common-sense[z]." War was resolved upon. But how was it to be maintained? what new and plausible motives could be given to the nation? the public treasury was empty, the king's exchequer exhausted, and public opinion was already so powerful, that it was thought a duty to consult it, even if it were not followed. The pretext sought for soon offered itself. From the beginning of the disturbances, cardinal Richelieu, displeased with the English court, in which Spanish influence prevailed, had been in treaty with the Scots; he maintained an agent among them, had upon several occasions furnished them with arms and money, and had promised greater assistance in case of need. A letter from the chief covenanters, bearing the address, 'To the King,' and evidently addressed to the king of France, to request his assistance, was intercepted[a]. Charles and the council did not doubt

[y] Rushworth, part 2. vol. i. p. 992—1015.

[z] Strafford's Letters, vol. ii. p. 138, 156.

[a] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 217; Whitelocke, p. 31. See in particular the pieces published on this subject by Mr. Mazure, at the end of his History of the Revolution of 1688, vol. iii. p. 402, note 4. They evidently prove, contrary to the opinion of Hume, and Mr. Laing, Brodie, etc. that the letter of the Scottish chiefs was actually sent to the king of France, and

but this appeal to a foreign prince, and which was high treason by law, would inspire all England with an indignation equal to their own; this was enough, they thought, to convince all minds of the legitimacy of the war. Full of this vain confidence, which seemed to hide from their own eyes the necessity to which they were reduced, the calling of a new parliament was agreed upon. In the time which must elapse before its assembling, Strafford went over to Ireland to see what supplies of men and money he could obtain from the parliament of that kingdom.

All England was astonished at the news that a new parliament was summoned; a legal reform, though the only one that had been thought of, had ceased to be hoped for. Notwithstanding its great discontent, no violent designs had been formed by the nation. Sectarians, in some places the multitude, and a few men already known as the leaders of parties struggling for power, alone fostered darker passions and deeper designs. The public had upheld them in their resistance, but without partaking of their projects, or being even aware that they existed. A long continuation of troubles had made a great many good citizens doubt, if not the lawfulness, at least the propriety of the ardour and obstinacy of the last parliament. Without blaming them, the rude-

that he received it, though Charles managed to intercept a copy of it.

[b] March 16th, 1640.

ness of their speech, and the riotous scenes which had taken place, were remembered with regret; more moderation was this time anticipated. In this disposition, a house of commons was elected, opposed to the court, resolved to have all grievances redressed, and in which all those men whose opposition had rendered them popular took a seat; still the majority of them were peaceable citizens, free from all party ties, hating all violence, secret combinations, and hasty resolutions, and hoping they should be able to reform all abuses without offending the king, or hazarding the peace of the country.

After a rather long delay, which gave some displeasure, the parliament at last met[c]. Charles had the letter of the Scottish malcontents to the king of France laid before the lower house; dwelt at length on their treasonable conduct, announced his intention of carrying on the war with vigour, and begged for subsidies. The house of commons took little notice of the letter; they seemingly regarded it as a thing of little importance compared with the great interests they had at stake[d]. This offended the king, who thought the house showed too much indifference at the wrongs he had received. The house, on their side, complained of the want of respect and attention shown their speaker, on the day of his presentation to the king[e]. The court, after having passed eleven years without

[c] April 13th, 1640.

[d] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 535, 542.

[e] Ibid.

a parliament, found some difficulty in laying aside their thoughtless contempt: and the house, on its return to Westminster, assumed the haughty demeanour of a power that had been eleven years slighted, and was, at last, recalled from sheer necessity. The debates soon became serious. The king wanted the house to vote the subsidies before they proceeded to examine their grievances, promising he would let them sit afterwards, and would listen with attention to their representations. Long discussions took place on this subject, but without any violence, though the meetings were zealously attended, and prolonged much later than usual[f]. A few bitter words escaped from some obscure members, but were immediately repressed; and the speeches of several servants of the crown, in other respects much esteemed, met with a favourable reception[g]. It was in vain repeated to the house that the war was urgent; they in fact cared little for the war, though respect for the king kept them from owning it. Charles addressed himself to the lords. They voted that in their opinion the grant of subsidies should precede the redress of grievances; and begged a conference with the commons to exhort them to this procedure[h]. The commons accepted the conference, but on their return they voted that

[f] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 227, 233.

[g] Ibid. p. 229, 234, 236.

[h] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 560; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 230.

the conduct of the lords was a breach of privilege; and that they had no right to interfere in the matter of subsidies[j]. Pym, Hampden, St. John, and others of that party, made the most of this incident to inflame the house, whose intentions were more moderate than was agreeable to their views and principles. The house was much agitated, and felt very impatient; and though it restrained its power, seemed still resolved to maintain its rights. Time was lost, and the king already begun to listen to those who said this parliament would be as unmanageable as the last. Under some irritation he sent a message to the house, saying, that if they would grant him twelve subsidies, payable in the course of three years, he would engage henceforth never to levy ship-money without the consent of parliament[k]. The sum was thought enormous; it was more, they said, than all the money in the kingdom. Besides, it was not sufficient that the king should give up this odious impost; he must, as a principle, declare it to be illegal, as well for the past as the future. The house, however, had no desire to break entirely with the king; it was demonstrated that the amount of the twelve subsidies was not, by a great deal, so high as it was at first thought to be; and though they were reluctant to suspend the examination of grievances, yet, to show their

[j] Parl. Hist. col. 563; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, p. 231.

[k] May 4th, 1640; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. p. 570, 571; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 232.

loyalty, they agreed to take the message into consideration. They were on the point of deciding that the subsidies should be granted without fixing their amount, when Sir Harry Vane rose, and said, that unless the whole of the message were admitted, it was not worth while to deliberate, for that the king would not accept less than he had asked. Herbert confirmed what Vane had asserted[l]. Anger and astonishment took possession of the house: even the most moderate were struck with consternation. It was late, the debate was adjourned till the next day. But on that day, the moment the commons assembled, the king summoned them to the upper house; and there, only three weeks after its meeting, the parliament was dissolved[m].

An hour after the dissolution, Edward Hyde[n], afterwards lord Clarendon, met St. John the friend of Hampden, and one of the leaders of the opposition, who were already formed into a party: Hyde was dispirited; St. John, on the contrary, though of a naturally melancholy countenance, and who was never known to smile, now looked joyful and animated:— "What disturbs you?" said he to Hyde; "That which disturbs more than one honest person," answered Hyde, "the imprudent dissolution of a parliament, which could alone remedy the present disorders." "Ah well," said St. John, "be-

[l] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 238.

[m] May 5th, 1640.

[n] Born February 16th, 1608 at Dinton, Wilts.

fore things grow better, they must grow worse; this parliament would never have done what is necessary

On the evening of the same day, Charles was full of regret; the disposition of the house he said had been falsely represented to him: he had never authorised Sir Harry Vane to declare that unless he had the twelve subsidies he would accept of none. The next day being still more uneasy, he assembled a few experienced councillors and asked whether the dissolution could not be recalled. This was not considered possible; and Charles returned to despotism, a little more anxious, but as thoughtless and haughty as before the attempt he had just made to escape from it[p].

The critical situation of affairs seemed to give some confidence to his ministers, and to his measures some success; Strafford had returned from Ireland[q], suffering under a violent attack of the gout, threatened with a pleurisy, and unable to move[r]. But he had obtained from the Irish parliament all he wished; money, soldiers, offers, and promises; and as soon as he could leave his bed he returned to work with his usual vigour. In less than three weeks, by the influence of his example, more than 300,000*l.* was voluntarily contributed and placed in the exchequer; the

[o] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 240.
[p] Ibid. p. 241.
[q] April 4th, 1640.
[r] Strafford's Letters, vol. ii. p. 403.

papists furnishing the greatest part of it[s]. To procure money also the usual vexations were employed, forced loans, ship-money, and monopolies; the question of introducing base coin was even agitated[t]. In the eyes of the king and his ministers necessity excused every thing: but necessity is never the limit of tyranny; Charles renewed his former useless persecutions and acts of vengeance on the members of the parliament; Sir Henry Bellasis and Sir John Hotham were imprisoned for their speeches; the house and papers of lord Brook were searched; Mr. Crew was sent to the Tower for having refused to give up the petitions he had received during the session, as chairman of the committee appointed to examine them[u]. An oath was exacted from the clergy never to consent to any alteration in the government of the church; and the oath concluded with an *et cætera* which provoked a smile of bitterness and mistrust[x]. Never had more arrogant or more vindictive language been used: a few Yorkshire gentlemen had refused an arbitrary request; the council wished to prosecute them: "The only prosecution to be used," said Strafford

[s] Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 296.

[t] May, Hist. of the Long Parl.; Whitelocke, p. 31.

[u] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 584; Rushworth, part 2, vol. ii. p. 1196.

[x] The following was the purport of this paragraph: "I swear, never to give consent to any alteration in the government of this church, ruled as it is at present by archbishops, bishops, deacons, archdeacons, etc." Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 302; Rushworth, part 2, vol. ii. p. 1186.

is to send for them and have them put in irons[y]." He knew better than any other the extent of the mischief likely to follow upon such severity; but passion overcame both fear and prudence; one would have thought he wished to communicate to the king, the court, and the council, that fever which blinds man to his weakness and to his danger. Again he fell ill, and was even at the brink of the grave; but his helpless condition only increased the harshness of his counsels; and no sooner was he able to stand than he departed with the king to take command of the army, already assembled on the frontiers of Scotland.

On his route he learnt that the Scots, impatient for action, had entered England[z]; and on his arrival at York he found that at Newburn[a] they had beaten, almost without resistance, the first English troops they had met with on their march. These events were not the work of the Scots alone. During the peace, their commissioners in London, had contracted a close alliance with the leaders of the malecontents, who had exhorted them, in case the war should be renewed, to invade England suddenly, promising them powerful aid. A messenger was even sent to Scotland, bearing inclosed in a hollow staff an engagement to that purpose, at the end of which, to inspire the Scots with more confidence, lord Saville, the only leader of the plot, had counterfeited the signature of six of the most powerful

[y] Strafford's Letters, vol. ii. p. 409.

[z] August 21st, 1640. [a] August 28th, 1640.

English lords. Violent hatred of Strafford was the only motive that induced lord Saville, a despicable man, to engage in this audacious intrigue; but every thing seems to confirm the fact that sincere and influential patriots had also taken a part in it [b]. They were not deceived in the disposition of the people. Parliament was no sooner dissolved than aversion for the war was everywhere manifested. In London, placards on all sides excited the apprentices to destroy Laud, the author of so many evils. A furious crowd attacked his palace, and he was obliged to seek refuge at Whitehall. St. Paul's was forcibly entered by another party, who cried: *no bishops; no high commission* [c]! In the counties violence was the only means of raising recruits. To avoid being enrolled, many mutilated themselves, others committed suicide [d]; those who enlisted without resistance, were insulted in the streets and treated as cowards by their friends and families. With this reluctant spirit they joined their regiments, and found in them the same feelings. Several officers, suspected of papistry were murdered by their soldiers [e]. When the army came up with the Scots, the murmurs and want of discipline were redoubled; they saw the written covenant

[b] Burnet, Hist. of his Own Times, vol. i. p. 51—57, of the *Collection de Mémoires*; Whitelocke's Memorials, etc. p. 31; Hardwicke's Papers, vol. ii. p. 187.

[c] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 246; Whitelocke, p. 33.

[d] Strafford's Letters, vol. ii. p. 351.

[e] Rushworth, part 2, p. 1191—1195.

floating on the Scottish standard, they could hear the drum summon the troops to sermon, and at sunrise the whole camp ringing with psalm-singing and prayers. At this sight, and when accounts of the pious ardour and friendly dispositions of the Scots towards the English reached their ears, the soldiers were alternately softened and incensed, cursed the impious war in which they were engaged, and were already vanquished; they felt as if fighting against their brethren and their God[f]. Upon their arrival on the banks of the Tyne, the Scots, without any hostile demonstration, asked leave to pass. An English sentinel fired at them; a few cannons answered; but the action had scarcely commenced when the army was scattered, and Strafford took the command of it only to return to York; leaving the Scots undisputed masters of the country from the borders to that city[g]. From that moment Strafford himself was conquered. In vain did he attempt, by using alternately flattery and threats, to inspire the troops with other feelings; his advances to the officers were cold; his anger and contempt but ill concealed; and his rigour, instead of frightening the soldiers, only irritated them. In this state of affairs, several petitions arrived from the counties, entreating the king to conclude a peace. Lord Wharton and Lord Howard ventured to present one themselves;

[f] Heylin, Life of Laud, p. 454.

[g] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 248—250; Rushworth, part 2, vol. ii. 1236.

Strafford caused them to be arrested, assembled a court martial, and demanded that they should be shot, in presence of the whole army, as the abettors of rebellion.

The court remained silent: Hamilton was the first to speak: "My lord," said he to Strafford, "if we pronounce this sentence, are you sure that the soldiers will execute it?" Strafford, as if a veil had suddenly been removed from his eyes, with a shudder turned away his head and made no reply[h]: Yet his pride was unsubdued and still upheld his hopes; he wrote to Laud: "Let the king but speak the word, and I will make the Scots go from hence much faster than they came; I would answer for it, on my life; but this advice should come from another than me." In fact, Charles, afraid of the energy of his counsels, already avoided him.

The king had fallen into deep despondency; every day brought him new proofs of his weakness; he had no money, nor did he know by what means to obtain any; mutiny was in his army, whole bands of soldiers deserted together; the people were every where agitated and impatient for some movement; while intercourse with the Scots was renewed around him, not only in his camp, but even in his house. The Scots, always prudent in their actions and humble in their speech, spared the counties they had invaded, showed much regard to their prisoners,

[h] Burnet, History of his Own Times, vol. i. p. 56, in the Collection.

and renewed at every opportunity the declaration of their pacific intentions, and of their fidelity and devotion to the king; certain of the victory, and merely anxious to obtain peace as its guarantee. When peace was spoken of, a parliament also was often mentioned. At the very name, Charles was seized with fear, and resolved[i], by whose advice is not known, to assemble at York the great council of the peers of the kingdom; a feudal assembly, which for four centuries had not been called together, but which formerly, when the commons were weak, had often alone partaken of sovereign power. Without well knowing what it was, or what this assembly could do, it was hoped that they would have more complaisance and regard for the king's honour than a regular parliament; it was debated whether it would not be possible for them alone to vote subsidies[k]. But, before this great council could meet, two petitions arrived, one from the city of London[l], the other from twelve of the most considerable peers in the kingdom[m], soliciting in express terms, the convocation of another parliament. This was enough to overcome the faint resistance of a king whose power was destroyed. In the midst of these disquietudes, Strafford, as much to gratify his resent-

[i] September 7th, 1640; Rushworth, part 2, vol. ii. p. 1257.

[k] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 253.

[l] Rushworth, part 2, vol. ii. p. 1263.

[m] Rushworth, p. 1260; the twelve signatures were those of the lords Essex, Bedford, Hertford, Warwick, Bristol, Mulgrave, Say and Seal, Howard, Bolingbroke, Mandeville, Brook, and Paget.

ment, as to justify his counsels, had attacked the Scots and obtained some advantage over them; he was censured as having compromised the king's interests, and received orders to confine himself to his quarters[n]. The peers met[o]. Charles informed them that he was about to summon a parliament, and that he only claimed their counsels as to the best mode of treating with the Scots[p]. Negotiations were begun. Sixteen peers, all inclined to the popular party, were selected to conduct them[q]. It was at first stipulated that both armies should remain standing, and that the king should pay the Scottish soldiers as well as his own. To do this a loan of £200,000 was requested of the city of London, and the king and the peers gave their word as a guarantee for its faithful expenditure[r]. After the preliminary articles were signed at Rippon, Charles, anxious to lay aside for a while the weight of so many cares and to enjoy the queen's society, transferred the negotiation to London[s],

[n] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. i. p. 273. Lingard, Hist. of England, vol. x. p. 95, note 94, and Brodie, Hist. of the British Empire, etc. vol. ii. p. 589, deny these facts, from inductions derived from contemporary and official documents; but their reasons do not appear to me sufficient to justify the rejection of the assertion of Clarendon, whose narrative is circumstantial, and who had no reason to deviate from truth on this subject.

[o] September 24th, 1640.

[p] Rushworth, part 2, vol. ii. p. 1275.

[q] The lords were Bedford, Hertford, Essex, Salisbury, Warwick, Bristol, Holland, Berkshire, Mandeville, Wharton, Paget, Brook, Pawlet, Howard, Saville, Dunsmore.

[r] Rushworth, part 2, vol. ii. p. 1279.

[s] October 23rd, 1640; ibid. p. 1286—1305.

where the parliament were soon to assemble. The Scottish commissioners hastened thither, certain of meeting there many powerful allies. The elections were going forward all over England; the nation was eager for the result; the court, dispirited and sad, in vain sought to exercise some influence over them; their candidates, who were but feebly supported, met with repulses on all sides; even Sir Thomas Gardiner, whom the king wished to be speaker, was defeated[t]. The meeting of parliament was fixed for the 3rd of November. Some advised Laud to choose another day, urging that as an unlucky one; for under Henry the Eighth, when the parliament had met on that day, they began by the ruin of cardinal Wolsey, and ended by the destruction of the monasteries[u]. Laud disregarded these omens, not that he was confident, but he was weary of the struggle, and like his master abandoned all to chance and futurity. Little, however, did either party suspect what that future would bring to pass.

[t] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 2; Whitelocke, p. 35.

[u] Whitelocke, p. 35.

HISTORY OF

HE ENGLISH REVOLUTION.

FROM THE ACCESSION OF CHARLES I.

BOOK THE THIRD.

1640—1642.

On the appointed day the king opened parliament. He went to Westminster without pomp, almost without retinue, not on horseback and along the streets, as usual, but by the Thames, in a plain boat, and shunning all eyes, like one who follows the triumph of his conqueror. His speech was vague and confused. In it he promised to redress all grievances; but he persisted in calling the Scots 'rebels', and demanded that they should be driven from the kingdom, as if the war had not been over. The commons listened with cold respect. Never at the beginning of a session had their number been so great; never had they assumed so proud a mien in presence of the sovereign [a].

As soon as the king was gone, the few in the house who were devoted to him, soon discovered

[a] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 1—4, col. 629.

by the conversation of the different groups, that the public wrath surpassed even what they had feared. The dissolution of the last parliament had incensed even the most moderate. None spoke of conciliation or prudence. The day was now come, they said, when they should employ the whole power they possessed, and eradicate all abuses in such a manner that not one should grow up again. Thus with very unequal strength, though with thoughts equally haughty, the two powers met. For eleven years the king and the church had proclaimed themselves entitled by right to absolute and independent sovereignty; and they had attempted every thing to make the nation endure its sway. In this they had been unsuccessful, yet they reiterated the same maxims, and in their adversity came to seek help from an assembly, who, without establishing it as a principle, and without affecting any display, also believed in their own sovereignty and felt themselves capable of exercising it.

They began by setting forth all their grievances. Each member who arrived was the bearer of a petition from his town or county; he read it immediately, made it the subject of his speech, and requested that, at least, till more efficacious measures could be adopted, the house should vote the complaints to be lawful[b]. Thus, in a few days, the opinions of the whole country

[b] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 640—666.

were known. Thus all tyrannical acts, monopolies, ship-money, arbitrary arrests, the usurpation of the bishops, and the proceedings of the courts of exemption, were suddenly reviewed and condemned. None opposed these proceedings[c]; such was their unanimity, that several resolutions were adopted on the motion of men, who, soon after, became the most intimate confidants of the king[d].

As if these means were not sufficient to reveal the whole, more than forty committees were appointed to inquire into abuses and to receive complaints[e]. Day after day, tradesmen and farmers came, on horseback, in whole bands to state other grievances in the name of their towns or districts[f]. In every quarter the people were incited to bring forward charges from the pulpit as well as in other public places; and it was eagerly received from whomsoever it came, and admitted with equal confidence, whether the whole government was arraigned or the conduct of some individual whose punishment was demanded. The power of the committees knew no limits; no one dared to condemn them even by silence, and the members of the privy council themselves were obliged to answer for their proceedings[g].

[c] Parl. Hist. col. 672.

[d] Sir John Colepepper, lord Digby, lord Falkland, etc.

[e] Rushworth, part 2. vol. i. p. 28; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 318.

[f] Whitelocke, Memorials, etc. p. 36.

[g] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 43.

With the disapprobation of deeds was connected the entire proscription of their authors. Every agent of the crown, of what rank soever, who had taken a part in the execution of those measures which were complained of, was marked by the name of 'delinquent[h].' In every county a list of these delinquents was drawn up. No uniform and definitive punishment was pronounced against them; but they could, at any time, at the pleasure of the house, be summoned to appear and be condemned to fines, imprisonment, or confiscation.

In verifying their own elections, the house voted that whoever had taken part in any monopolies, was unworthy to take a seat among them[i]. Four members were on this account excluded[k]. Several others were also expelled under the pretext of some irregularities, but, in fact, without any legal disqualification, but only because their opinions were suspected. Two of the most noted monopolists, Sir Henry Mildmay and Mr. Whitaker, were admitted without obstacle; they had come over to the parliament[l].

At the aspect of this immense power, so unexpected, so violent, all the servants of the crown, and all those who had enemies or who were conscious of offence, were stricken with fear. They were accused on all sides and knew not where to

[h] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 14.

[i] November 9th, 1640. [k] January 21st, 1641.

[l] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 651, 656, 707; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 13.

seek for protection. The court merely sought to be forgotten; the king concealed his uneasiness and sorrow in complete inaction; the judges, fearful for themselves, would not have dared to protect a delinquent; the bishops, without attempting to prevent it, saw their own innovations abolished around them. John Bancroft, bishop of Oxford, died suddenly through agitation and fear [m]; the presbyterian preachers, returned without any legal title, to the possession of their curacies and pulpits; all the dissenting sects again assembled in public; and pamphlets of all descriptions circulated in full liberty. Though the ministers, the tribunals, the laws, and the worship of royal and episcopal despotism still existed, they were deprived of power, and therefore remained inactive [n]. Strafford had foreseen this state of things, and had begged the king to dispense with his attendance in parliament. "I shall not be of any use there to your majesty," he wrote to him, "my presence will aggravate your dangers, and put me in the hands of my enemies; allow me to keep aloof, in Ireland or with the army, wherever your majesty pleases; I shall be able to serve you still and save myself from the ruin that awaits me."—The king answered: "I cannot do without your advice; as true as I am king of England you have nothing to fear; they shall not touch a hair

[m] Rapin Thoiras, Hist. of England, vol. ix. p. 21.

[n] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 59; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 329—342.

of your head[o]." Strafford still hesitated, but upon a second invitation, braving the storm, since he was forced to endure it, he set out with the resolution of himself accusing before the upper house, on proofs which he had recently collected, the principal leaders in the commons of having excited and encouraged the Scottish rebellion. Aware of his intention, Pym and his friends resolved to strike the first blow. Strafford arrived in London on the 9th of November; on the 10th, he was confined to his bed with fever and fatigue; on the 11th, the doors of the house of commons were closed, and, on the motion of Pym, Strafford was at once accused of high treason. Lord Falkland, though he was his enemy, said that a delay and some examination appeared to him necessary, if it were only out of regard to the justice and dignity of the house. "The least delay will lose every thing," said Pym; "if the earl talk but once with the king, parliament will be dissolved; besides, the house only accuse, they will not judge him." And he departed immediately, with a committee, to lay the accusation before the lords[p].

Strafford was at that time with the king. At the first hint, he flew to the upper house, where Pym had arrived before him. He found the

[o] Whitelocke, p. 36. One would think that Mr. Lingard, (History of England, vol. x. p. 207,) was not acquainted with this passage; for he says that the friends of Strafford advised him not to go to London, but that for his own part he did not hesitate an instant.

[p] State Trials, vol. iii. col. 1383 in the note.

doors closed, and angrily rebuked the keeper, who hesitated to admit him. He was crossing the hall to take his seat, when several voices ordered him to retire. The earl stopped, looked round, and, after a few minutes' hesitation, obeyed. An hour after, he was recalled, and ordered to kneel down at the bar: there he learned that the lords had admitted the justice of the accusation of the commons, and had decided at their request that he should be sent to the Tower. He was about to speak, but the house refused to hear him, and the order of commitment was directly executed [q].

To the impeachment of Strafford, that of Laud almost immediately succeeded; he was less feared though still more detested. A fanatic as much blinded by prejudice as he was sincere, his conscience reproached him with nothing, and the impeachment surprised him: he said, "no member of the commons could, in his heart, believe him guilty of treason." The earl of Essex rudely took up these words, as insulting to the commons, who had accused him. Laud was astonished, made an apology, and begged to be treated according to the ancient usages of parliament. Lord Say was indignant that he should pretend to prescribe their mode of procedure. The agitated archbishop was silent, incapable of understanding other passions than his own, or of remembering that he had ever thus spoken to his enemies [r].

[q] State Trials, vol. iii. col. 1384 in the note.

[r] September 18th, 1640; State Trials, vol. iv. col. 319.

Two other ministers, the lord keeper, Finch, and the secretary of state, Windebank, had also taken an active part in tyranny; but one, an artful courtier, had foreseen what was coming, and for the last three months had applied himself at his master's expense, to gain the indulgence of the party leaders; the other a weak man, and of an understanding not above mediocrity, inspired neither hatred nor fear. Yet the commons accused them, though without anger and as if merely to satisfy the public. Windebank absconded. Lord Finch obtained permission to appear before the house, and, with graceful humility, made an apology[s]. The party were pleased with this first homage of a minister to their power, and allowed him time to escape beyond sea. Several members were astonished at this partial justice; but Pym and Hampden, as crafty leaders, did not wish to discourage meanness[t]. Impeachments against two bishops, several theologians, and six judges were also drawn up. But the impeachment of Strafford was alone followed up with ardour. A secret committee, vested with immense powers, was commissioned to scrutinise his whole life, to trace out the proofs of high treason in his words as well as in his actions, and even in the counsels he had given to the king, whether those counsels had

[s] December 21st, 1640.

[t] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 686; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 15, 17; May, Hist. of the Long Parl. vol. i. p. 167—172, in the Collection; Whitelocke, p. 38.

been adopted or not[u]. A similar committee established in Ireland, served as an auxiliary to that of the commons. The Scots joined them with a virulent declaration, intimating that their army should not leave the kingdom till sentence had been passed on their most cruel enemy. In the present state of popular feeling it was not considered too much that the three kingdoms should thus be united against an accused individual[x].

Thus, delivered from their adversaries and preparing a signal vengeance against the only one they feared, the commons took possession of the government. They voted subsidies, though so small as only sufficient to supply the necessities of each day[y]. Commissioners selected from among the members and named in the bill, were alone entrusted with their expenditure. The custom duties were only voted for two months, at the expiration of which they were renewed[z]. In order to meet the expenses, more prompt and considerable revenues were needed; the commons therefore borrowed, in their own name, from their partisans in the city, even from their own members, and on the security of their promise only: thus originated public credit[a]. The king was anxious that the two armies should be disbanded.

[u] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 42.

[x] Ibid. p. 80. The trial of Strafford forms the 8th volume of Rushworth's collection; the reader is referred to it once for all.

[y] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 701.

[z] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 69.

[a] Ibid. p. 66.

particularly that of the Scots, and expatiated with advantage on the burden they were to the northern counties; but the house stood in need of them[b], and felt itself capable of inducing the people to bear this burden: "The Philistines are yet too strong for us," said Mr. Strode, we cannot do without our allies." The king's entreaties were eluded, and even in the distribution of the funds allotted for the pay, more favour was shown to the Scots than to the English troops, whose officers did not so generally inspire the parliament with confidence[c]. Some of the latter took offence, but the house was unconcerned. A vote was also passed that the Scots had lent a brotherly assistance to the English, that for the future they should be called brothers, and, as an indemnity and reward, the house voted 300,000*l.* in their favour. The negotiations for a definitive peace with Scotland, were conducted more by a committee of parliament than by the king's council. The leaders of both houses, particularly those of the commons, dined together every day at Mr. Pym's at their own expense; they were joined there by the Scottish commissioners, by the authors of the principal petitions, and by the most influential men in the city. In these parties the affairs of both houses and of the state were canvassed[d]. Such was the deference of all powers to that of parliament, that the counsellors of the crown, incapable or

[b] Baillie, Letters, vol. i. p. 240. [c] Whitelocke, p. 44.
[d] Clarendon. Memoirs, in the Collection, vol. i. p. 119.

afraid to decide any question of themselves, referred to it on all occasions, even when no request to that effect had been presented. A Roman catholic priest, Goodman, had been condemned to death; the king who dared not grant his reprieve, placed his life at the disposal of the commons, the only means of saving it; for, notwithstanding their vehemence they evinced no sanguinary dispositions [e]. The people had conceived a hatred for the queen's mother, Marie de Medicis, then a refugee in England: the multitude daily surrounded her house, loading her with threats and insults. It was inquired of the commons whether or not she ought to remain in England, and in what manner her safety could best be secured. They answered that she should depart, and voted 10,000*l.* for her journey; their wish was immediately complied with [f].

The judgments which the courts of law had long since pronounced, as well as the affairs of the king and court, came under their jurisdiction. The condemnation of Prynne, Burton, Bastwick, Leighton, and Lilburne, was declared illegal, and their liberation ordered [g], together with a large indemnity, which, however, they never received; such is the common fate of past merits—soon to be effaced by new deserts and necessities. The joy of the public was their only recompense: at

[e] In February 1641; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 710, 713, 715; State Trials, vol. iv. col. 59—63.

[f] In May 1641; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 788, 793; May, Hist. of the Long Parl. vol. i. 209, in the Collection.

[g] November 7th, 1640; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 639, 731.

the news of their return an immense crowd flocked to meet them; everywhere, as they passed, the streets were decorated with flags and laurels, and rosemary was strewed under their feet[h]. The transports of the people, the king's despondency, every thing urged on the commons to take into their own hands the reins of government, every thing concurred to elevate them into a sovereign power.

Their first attempt at the reform of institutions, if it did not proclaim their sovereignty, at least proclaimed their independence. A bill was proposed[i], which provided for the calling a new parliament every three years. Should the king fail to convoke one, twelve peers assembled at Westminster would be authorised to summon one without his co-operation. If the peers did not, the sheriffs and municipal officers were ordered to proceed with the elections; and if the sheriffs neglected to see to it, the citizens had a right to assemble and elect their members themselves. No parliament could be dissolved or adjourned without the consent of the two houses, till fifty days after their meeting; and to the houses alone belonged the choice of the speaker[k]. At the first news of this bill the king broke the silence he had till then preserved, and assembled both houses at Whitehall[l]. He said he ap-

[h] May, Hist. of the Long. Parl., vol. i. p. 157, in the Collection; Whitelocke, p. 37.

[i] January 19th, 1641.

[k] Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 189.

[l] January 23rd, 1641; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 710—712.

proved of the frequent calling of parliaments, as one of the best means of maintaining the harmony he so much desired between himself and his people. But that sheriffs and constables should be vested with the right of exercising his prerogative, was what he could not consent to. The house only saw in these declarations a new motive to hasten the adoption of the bill; none dared counsel the king to refuse; but he thought it became his dignity to show the extent of his displeasure on the occasion. He said that after what he had granted, he knew not what they could ask of him, or what he could refuse: That, so far, certainly, they had but little encouraged him to show them so much favour; they had only busied themselves on their own concerns, and not at all on his; they had completely subverted the government, and it was almost off its hinges. He hoped, now that he had fulfilled all he had promised, that they also would think of doing their duty [l].

The houses voted solemn thanks to the king; and immediately began the work of reform by demanding, in successive motions, the abolition of the star chamber, the north court, the court of high commission, and all the tribunals of exception [m].

None opposed these proposals; the mere statement of grievances held the place of any

[l] February 16th, 1641; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. p. 716, 717

[m] Ibid. col. 717, 722, 766.

debate. Even those men who began to fear an irregular movement, and to suspect the hidden thoughts of the party, would not have dared to defend powers which were odious through their acts, and, in reality illegal, though several were vested with a legal existence. A political reformation was unanimously desired by all, without reference to their social condition or their religious principles; though no one, as yet, thought of measuring precisely its consequences or its extent. Every one concurred in it without questioning himself as to his intention and motives. Men of a bold mind, or of a long and obstinate foresight, or those who were already compromised by proceedings that the laws condemned, such as Hampden, Pym, Hollis, Stapleton, intended to bereave the crown of its fatal prerogative, to transfer the government to the house, and to settle it there for ever. This was in their eyes the right of the nation; and for the people as well as for themselves the only sure guarantee. But still they proceeded in this design without declaring it, and more by necessity than by any clearly conceived principle which public opinion avowed. Yet, among them, some violent sectaries, and a few who were then obscure though very active members, Cromwell, Henry Martyn, and others, occasionally gave utterance to more threatening language against the king or the form of government; but they seemed without consideration and credit, at least in the house; and even those who wondered at their violence

were not alarmed at it. Most of them hoped, that, after the reformation of abuses, they should return to that condition which they called the state of old England; namely, the king's supremacy restricted by the periodical exercise of the power of the two houses within the limits of the law; and till that time they accepted as a temporary necessity, the almost exclusive power of the commons; a power that was more in accordance than they themselves suspected with the rather confused feelings and ideas which animated them. Thus political reformation, equally the wish of all, though with very different views and hopes, was going on with the ascendancy of irresistible unanimity.

In religious matters it was quite different. The very first day, diversity of wishes and opinions was manifested. A petition from the city of London, backed by 15,000 signatures, prayed for the entire abolition of episcopacy[n]. Nearly at the same time, seven hundred ecclesiastics solicited for a reform only of the temporal power of the bishops, of their despotism in the church, and of the bad administration of church revenues; and soon after, nineteen petitions, signed, it is said, by more than 100,000 people, arrived from the counties, recommending the maintenance of episcopal government[o]. In the parliament the same dissensions were manifested. The petition

[n] December 11th, 1640; Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 98

[o] Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 356.

of the city was with great difficulty admitted by the commons after a violent debate[p]. A bill was proposed declaring all ecclesiastics incapable of any civil function, and excluding the bishops from the house of lords; but in order to induce the commons to adopt it[q], the presbyterian party were forced to promise that they would go no further; and on this condition alone did Hampden obtain the sanction of lord Falkland[r]; still the bill, after all, was rejected by the lords[s]. Maddened by this disappointment, the presbyterians requested at once the destruction of bishoprics, deaneries, and chapters[t]; but the opposition was so warm that they resolved to adjourn their motion. At one time the two houses appeared united to repress the disorders that broke out on all sides in public worship, and to maintain its legal forms[u]; but in two days their unanimity disappeared. Of their own authority, without even informing the lords, the commons sent commissioners into the counties to remove images, altars, crucifixes, and all other remains of idolatry, out of all churches[x]; and these messengers sanctioned by

[p] Baillie, Letters, vol. i. p. 244; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 61.

[q] March 9th and 11th, 1641.

[r] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 114—118.

[s] May 24th and June 7th, 1641; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 794—814.

[t] May 27th, 1641; Parl. Hist., col. 814; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 120, 121, 122.

[u] January 16th, 1641; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 339.

[x] January 23rd, 1641. Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 343.

their presence those popular passions which had already broken forth before their arrival. On their side, the lords, finding that the independents had again publicly resumed their meetings[x], summoned their leaders to the bar[y]; and, though they did it timidly, yet they reproved them. No unanimous opinion nor intention on the subject of religion really prevailed in the nation. Among the partisans of episcopacy, some, though a small number, animated with the energy of faith or the obstinacy of personal interest, maintained its pretensions to divine right; others looked upon it as a human institution, but thought it necessary to monarchy, and that the dignity of the throne would be compromised should the power of the bishops be seriously affected; others, again, and these the most numerous, would willingly have excluded the bishops from all share in temporal affairs, and only have allowed them to remain at the head of the church, as tradition and the laws and customs of the nation seemed to justify. In the opposite party feelings were no less dissimilar; some were attached to episcopacy by habit, although their sentiments were unfavourable to it; in the opinion of many, and these among the most enlightened, no church constitution existed by divine right, nor was absolutely legitimate; it might be varied according to time or place; the parliament was at liberty

[x] January 18th, 1641.

[y] January 19th; Neal, History of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 342.

to alter it at any time, as it thought best for the interest of the public, which ought alone to decide the fate of episcopacy, whose abolition or maintenance rested upon no fixed principle. But the presbyterians and their ministers saw in episcopal government an idolatry condemned by the gospel, and the inheritor and forerunner of popery; they repelled, with the indignation of faith, its liturgy, its form of worship, its most distant consequences; and claimed that divine right which the bishops had usurped, as the prerogative of the republican constitution of the church.

For some time, and after the first success of the political reformation, these dissensions presented obstacles to the proceedings of parliament. No sooner were religious questions introduced than the opponents of the court, hitherto unanimous, became divided; the majorities varied considerably, and no party came forward which was on every occasion animated by the same spirit, and so devoted to the same objects as to ensure its carrying every thing before it. Pym and Hampden, the leaders of the political reformation, carefully spared the presbyterians, and supported even their boldest motions; yet every one knew they did not partake of their fanatical zeal, that their endeavour was rather to reduce the temporal power of the bishops than to alter the constitution of the church[z], which, even in the upper house, among the most popular lords, had numerous

[z] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 114.

partisans. A few prudent men advised the king to make the most of these dissensions, and to prevent the union of the political and religious reformers, by boldly trusting the affairs of the state to the former.

Negotiations were commenced. The marquis of Hamilton, who was always willing to interpose between the parties, exerted himself with great activity. The earl of Bedford, a moderate man, influential in the upper house, and much esteemed by the public, also took a share in these negotiations, and conducted himself with dignity. The leaders of both houses often assembled at his house; he possessed their confidence and seemed authorised to treat in their name. The king, who was apt to consent sooner than he himself wished, first formed a new privy council[a]; the lords Bedford, Essex, Warwick, Say, Kimbolton, and a few others were chosen; all of them were of the popular party, and some even actively engaged in the opposition; but they were all powerful noblemen. The pride of Charles, already deeply wounded at the necessity of bending before these, would not allow him to own his defeat to any of lower degree. But it was insisted upon; the new councillors would not be separated from their friends; and every day revealed more and more to the king how important was the power of those leaders of the commons whom he held in such bitter con-

[a] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 46.

tempt. On their side, without showing themselves averse to these proposals, they manifested but little eagerness to accept them, not so much from indifference as from perplexity. By accepting them, they would obtain at once the principal aim of all their endeavours; in the name of the country they would obtain possession of legal power, have to impose rule to the monarch and to subject him to the counsels of the parliament. But the king's most ardent desire was to save Strafford and the church, or, in other words, he requested of them the release of their greatest enemy, and that they should break with the presbyterians, who were their warmest friends. On both sides perplexity was great, and suspicion too deeply rooted to give way at once to fear or ambition. Yet direct and precise proposals were made. Pym was to be chancellor of the exchequer, Hampden tutor to the prince of Wales, Hollis secretary of state, St. John was even, without hesitation, appointed solicitor-general. The ministry were to have for their chief the earl of Bedford, to whom the title of lord high treasurer was to be given. Those who had occupied these several offices had tendered their resignation, or it had already been accepted[b]. But while these negotiations were going on, perhaps on both sides without any warm desire of success, other proposals reached the king far more likely to obtain his

[b] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 73, etc.; Whitelocke, p. 39; Sidney Papers, vol. ii. pp. 664, 666.

approbation. Discontent had spread in the army; several officers, even members of the commons, had openly manifested it: one of them said one day in the house that if the Scottish soldiers had only to ask for money to obtain it, the English soldiers would know how to do the same [c]. A report of this discontent soon reached the ears of the queen; her favourite, Henry Jermyn, sought connections with the malecontents, and by his interposition she received them at Whitehall and deplored with them their situation, which, though far less painful, far less perilous, was, she said, exactly the same as that of the king. Fawning and lively in her manners, and placing her whole confidence in them, she had easily persuaded them that the destiny of the state was in their power. Secret conferences were carried on, and in them all sorts of plans were proposed. Some suggested that the army should march forthwith to London, and without further delay take the king at once out of bondage; others more moderate, proposed that a petition should be addressed to parliament, in which they should express their devotion to the church and the king; declaring, that, according to their opinion, the reformation of the state was accomplished, and requesting that no more innovations should be introduced. Help from abroad was also spoken of, levies in France or Portugal; frivolous discourse without any result, but confidently ad-

[c] Whitelocke, p. 44.

vanced by thoughtless men, who were more anxious to shine at the moment than to be successful in the future. In the army some intrigues, more busy than efficacious, corresponded with these conversations. The malecontents came and went from the camp to London, and short notes circulated from station to station. At last, the king himself had an interview with Percy, brother to the earl of Northumberland, and one of those concerned in the plot; by Percy's advice he repelled all violent designs and the proposal of bringing the army to London; but the project of a petition as threatening to the parliament as those daily received by the commons were to the church and king, was submitted to him. He approved of it, and, to give influence to the leaders of the undertaking, he suffered himself to be persuaded to affix his initials to it in sign of approbration [d].

The plot continued without advancing; the petition was not presented, but nothing escapes the people when they are mistrustful; when they regard designs as actions, and words as designs. In taverns and public places, a multitude of voluntary spies collected imprudent speeches from the officers. Pym, charged with the police of the party, was speedily informed of them. Treachery soon revealed more; Goring, one of the conspirators, discovered the whole to the

[d] May, Hist. of the Long Parl. vol. i. p. 189, in the Collection; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 132; Whitelocke, p. 43, 44; Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 252, 257.

earl of Bedford. Nothing had been done; but the king had allowed the worst they could fear to be proposed to him. The leaders of the commons kept this discovery a secret, waiting for some great occasion* to make the most of it; they did not even break off the negotiations which were still carried on in the king's name on the subject of their appointment to the ministry. But, henceforth, all hesitation disappeared from their counsels; they united themselves closely with the fanatical presbyterians, the only party whose help was sure and whose devotion was inexhaustible, for they alone had fixed principles and ardent passions, a revolution to accomplish, and popular strength to perform it. In the mean time, Strafford's ruin was irrevocably resolved, and his trial now began[f].

The whole house of commons assisted to support the impeachment by their presence. Commissioners from Scotland and Ireland, who were also Strafford's accusers, sat with the English commons. Eighty peers were present as judges;

* Mr. Brodie denies this fact (Hist. of the British Empire, etc. vol. iii. p. 109, etc. and in the note) and thinks that Goring did not reveal the plot, till in the course of the month April 1641. This is indeed what might be concluded from Husband's Collection, p. 195, etc.; but an attentive examination of the whole of this intrigue, and a comparison of the different passages pointed out in the preceding note, will make it appear, I think, that the meetings of the officers had taken place from the beginning of the winter of 1641, and that Pym and his friends had received a hint of it in the beginning of March. This is also the opinion of Mr. Lingard, Hist. of England, vol. x. p. 128, note 27.

[f] March 22nd, 1641.

the bishops had retired, as was customary in all trials for life, the commons having strongly expressed their wish on the subject. Above the peers, in a closed gallery, sat the king and queen, anxious to see what passed, the king concealing his anguish, the queen her curiosity. In other galleries and seats, raised one above the other, were ranged a crowd of spectators, of both sexes, nearly all of high rank, already affected by the pomp of the spectacle, the importance of the trial, and the well-known character of the accused [g].

Strafford, conducted by water from the Tower to Westminster, passed through the crowd assembled at the doors, without either riot or insult; his recent grandeur, his deportment, and even the terror formerly inspired by his name, still commanded respect in spite of the general hatred. As he gradually advanced, (his form bent by sickness rather than age, yet his eye proud and beaming as in his youth,) the crowd, uncovering at the sight of him, drew back, and he saluted them with courtesy, looking upon these demonstrations of the people as a good omen [h]. Hope had not forsaken him; he despised his adversaries, he had well examined the charges brought against him, and did not doubt but that he should justify himself of the crime of high treason. The accusation of the Irish alone

[g] May, Hist. of the Long Parl. vol. i. p. 178; and the *Eclaircissemens historiques*, p. 413, in the Collection; State Trials, vol. iii. col. 1414; Rushworth, vol. 8. [h] State Trials, vol. iii col. 1417.

had a little astonished him; he could not understand how a kingdom till then so humble, so anxious even to flatter and to serve him, could thus have so suddenly changed.

The very next day, an incident showed him that he had misunderstood his situation, and how many difficulties would attend his defence. He said, that he hoped he should be able easily to repel the accusations of his enemies. Pym, who managed the trial, angrily took up these words. He contended that this was an insult addressed to the commons, and that it was a crime thus to accuse them of malicious enmity. Strafford was agitated; he fell upon his knees and made an apology, and from that time remained perfectly calm and self possessed, not a word escaped him nor the least sign of anger or even of impatience which could be turned to his disadvantage[1].

For seventeen days he alone defended himself against thirteen accusers, refuting the charges which they brought by turns against him. Many of his deeds were incontestably proved to be full of iniquity and tyranny; but others, which had been foolishly exaggerated or blindly believed from hatred, were easily repelled, while none strictly came within the legal definition of high treason. Strafford used every effort to dispossess them of this character, nobly accusing himself of imperfection and frailty, opposing modest dignity to the violence of his adversaries, and pointing out without contumely the passionate illegality of

[1] State Trials, vol. iii. col. 1420.

their proceedings. Shameful obstacles were placed in the way of his defence; his counsellors, who had been obtained with the greatest difficulty, and contrary to the will of the commons, were not allowed to speak on the facts nor to cross examine the witnesses; permission to bring forward witnesses for his defence was not granted him till three days after the debates had begun, and then most of them were in Ireland. At every opportunity he claimed what was his right, thanked his judges if they consented to acknowledge it, made no complaint when they refused, and simply replied to his enemies, who were impatient at the delays caused by his dextrous defence, that he thought it as much behoved him to defend his life as it did any one else to attack it.

So much energy perplexed and humbled his accusers. Twice did the commons summon the lords to hasten the conclusion of a trial, which, they said, was a loss of much precious time to them and to the country [k]. The lords refused, the success of the accused roused their energy. When the facts were debated, before Strafford's counsellors had opened their lips, or he himself resumed his defence, the committee for managing the prosecution felt vanquished, at least as to the proof of high treason. The excitement in the commons was extreme; protected by the letter of the law and his own fatal genius, must then this great criminal escape, and the greatest enemy of reform be suffered to live to oppose it? A violent

[k] March 25th, and April 9th; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 743.

measure was resolved upon. Sir Arthur Haslerig, an obdurate and very violent partisan, proposed to declare that Strafford was guilty, and to condemn him by a bill of attainder[l]. This proceeding, while it freed the judges from any law, was not without a precedent, though it had never been resorted to but in tyrannical times, and had always been soon after condemned as iniquitous. Some notes found among the papers of the secretary of state, Vane, and given up to Pym by his son[m], were produced as supplementary evidence sufficient to prove the guilt of high treason. They imputed to Strafford that he had advised the king, in open council, to employ the Irish army to subdue his English subjects. The words they attributed to him, though contradicted by several members of the council, and in themselves susceptible of a less odious interpretation, were too much of a character with his general conduct, and the maxims he had often professed, not to produce a strong impression on all minds. The bill immediately obtained a first reading. Some thought they sacrificed the law to justice, others justice to necessity.

In the mean time the trial continued; for Strafford's accusers were resolved to lose no chance against their prisoner, nor were they willing that the chance of this attack upon the

[l] April 10th, 1641.

[m] His name was Harry Vane, the same as his father's; he was born in 1612. It is he who will always be alluded to hereafter as one of the leaders of the independent party.

constitution should release him from that of being condemned by a legal tribunal. Before his counsellors began to speak on the question and to treat of it as they had right by law, Strafford resumed his defence [n]; he spoke for a long time with surprising eloquence, always elaborately proving that not one of his actions could by any law be brought under the denomination of high treason. Conviction was every instant more and more impressed on the minds of his judges, and he cleverly followed its progress, adapting his words to the impressions he observed, deeply agitated himself, but without being prevented by his emotion from perceiving and marking what was passing around. "My lords," he said, as he concluded, "these gentlemen at the bar say they speak for the sake of the commonwealth against my arbitrary tyranny; allow me to say that I speak for the sake of the commonwealth, against their arbitrary treason. We live under the protection of the laws; can we then be doomed to die by laws that do not exist. Your ancestors have carefully chained in the bonds of our statutes these terrible accusations of high treason; be not ambitious of more knowledge than they had in these killing and destructive arts. Do not avail yourselves of a few bloody examples; do not to your own destruction awake those sleeping lions, by rattling up a company of old records which have lain for so many ages by the wall, forgotten and neglected, and that might devour you and your

April 13th, 1641.

children. As for myself, were it not for the interest of your lordships and of those precious pledges which a saint in heaven has left me,"—here he pointed to his children and his weeping stopped him, but looking up again immediately, he continued—"I should not take the trouble to defend this decaying body, already loaded with so many infirmities; that, in truth, I have but little pleasure in bearing the weight of it any longer." Again he stopped, as if seeking an idea: "My lords," he continued, "I might still have spoken, but my voice and strength fail me; and with all tranquillity of mind, I submit, clearly and freely, to your judgment: and whether that righteous doom shall be life or death I freely accept it; *Te Deum laudamus.*"

The auditory were touched with pity and admiration. Pym was about to answer; Strafford looked at him; defiance spoke in the immobility of his carriage; his pale and protruded lip bore the expression of impassioned scorn. Pym was agitated and did not proceed; his hands shook, as he sought without finding it a paper which was just before his eyes. It was the answer he had prepared, and which he read without being listened to by any one, hastening to finish a discourse so foreign to the feelings of the assembly, and which he himself could scarcely utter [o].

Excitement passes away but anger remains; that of Pym and his friends rose to the highest degree. They hastened the second reading of the bill of

[o] State Trials, vol. iii. col. 1469.

attainder[p]. In vain was it opposed by Selden, one of the oldest and most illustrious defenders of liberty, by Holborne, one of Hampden's counsellors in the affair of shipmoney, and by several others[q]. It was now the only resource of the party; for they found that the lords would not condemn Strafford as judges, and in the name of the law. They would even have wished the trial to be suddenly suspended that the counsellors might not be heard; and such was their passionate excitement that they talked of summoning to the bar "those insolent counsellors who had dared to take the part of a man whom the house declared guilty of high treason[r]." The lords repelled these outrageous proposals; Strafford's counsellors were heard; but the commons did not answer; they did not even go to the house to hear them, observing that it was beneath them to wrestle with counsellors[s]; and four days after, notwithstanding the active opposition of lord Digby, who had till then been one of Strafford's most eager accusers, the bill of attainder passed the commons[t].

When this afflicting news reached the king, he no longer thought of any thing but the means of saving the earl at what rate soever: "Be assured," he wrote to him, "that you shall not suffer, either in your life, your fortune, or your honour." Every effort was made that was likely

[p] April 14th, 1641. [q] State Trials, vol. iii. col. 1469.
[r] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 98.
[s] Ibid. p. 101.
[t] April 21st, 1641.

to save him, with all the haste and blindness of fear and sorrow; the king sought to soften the commons by concessions and promises, and plans were concerted for the escape of the prisoner. But these plans injured the negotiations and the negotiations were injurious to the plans. The earl of Bedford, who appeared disposed to some compliance, died suddenly. The earl of Essex, in answer to Hyde, who was speaking of the insurmountable resistance that the king's conscience opposed to the bill, said: "The king is obliged to conform himself and his conscience, to the advice and conscience of parliament [u]." Sir William Balfour, the governor of the Tower, was offered 20,000*l.* and one of Strafford's daughters in marriage for his son, to lend his aid for his escape; but he refused. He was ordered to receive into the prison a hundred chosen men as guards, commanded by captain Billingsley, a discontented officer, who laid the information before the commons. Every day some new plan for the earl's escape failed. At last, the king, contrary to Strafford's own advice, caused both houses to be summoned; he acknowledged the earl's faults, and promised that he would never employ him again, not even as a constable, but declared at the same time that nothing could ever make him consent to his death [x].

But the hatred of the commons was inflexible, and much bolder than the king's sorrow: they

[u] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 130.

[x] August 1st, May 1641, vol. ii. col. 754.

had foreseen his resistance, and had prepared the means of overcoming it. Since the bill of attainder had been presented in the upper house, the multitude daily assembled round Westminster, armed with swords, knives, and cudgels; shouting aloud, 'Justice! Justice!' and threatening the lords who delayed its execution[y]. Lord Arundel[z] was obliged to leave his carriage, and, with his hat off, to beg of the multitude to retire, promising that he would do all in his power towards the accomplishment of their wishes. Fifty-nine members of the commons had voted against the bill; their names were placarded in the streets with these words over them: 'Here are the Straffordians, the betrayers of their country.' The same feelings were echoed from the pulpit; the ministers preached or prayed for the death of a great 'delinquent.' The lords, excited by the king's message, complained of these disturbances to the commons, who returned no answer[a]. Yet the bill still remained in suspense. A decisive blow, which till then had been held in reserve, was resolved upon: Pym, summoning fear to the help of revenge, revealed the plot of the officers and the court to raise the army against the parliament[b]. Some of those who were mentioned absconded, which confirmed every suspicion. A wild terror seized the house

[y] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 755; Whitelocke, p. 43.
[z] Lord Montgomery, according to Whitelocke, ibid.
[a] May 3rd, 1641; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 778.
[b] May 3rd, 1641; ibid. col. 776.

and the people. It was resolved that the doors should be closed, and that all letters from abroad should be opened[c]. A report was spread in the city[d] that the hall was undermined with gunpowder, and on the point of being blowed up; the militia flew to arms, and an immense multitude, flocking from all quarters, surrounded Westminster. Sir Walter Earl hastened to inform the house of it; while he was speaking, Mr. Middleton and Mr. Moyle, who were both remarkably corpulent, rose suddenly to listen to him; the floor creaked: "The house is blowing up!" cried several of the members at once, rushing out of the hall, into which the people immediately crowded; and such scenes as these were renewed twice in the course of a week[e]. In the midst of so many disturbances, measures skilfully combined were tending to establish the empire of the commons and the success of their designs. Following the example of the Scots, the two houses also entered into a covenant, by taking an oath of union for the defence of the protestant religion and of public liberties; the commons even wanted every citizen to join in it, and when the lords would not consent, they declared whoever should refuse, incapable of holding any office in church or state[f]. At last, to secure the future from any peril, a bill was proposed, declaring that this parliament could not be dissolved with-

[c] May 11th; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 788, 789.
[d] May 5th, 1641. [e] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 783, 788.
[f] Ibid. col. 778; Neal, History of the Puritans, vol. ii. p. 382.

out their own consent[g]. This bold measure scarcely occasioned any surprise; the necessity of giving a guarantee to loans which they said were now with more difficulty obtained, served as a pretext; and the general excitement prevented any objection. The lords attempted to amend the bill, but in vain: the upper house was conquered; the judges by their cowardice sanctioned their weakness; they declared, that according to the laws the crimes of Strafford really constituted high treason[h]. The bill of attainder was submitted to a last debate: thirty-four of the lords who had attended the trial were absent; among those present twenty-six voted for the bill, nineteen against it[i]; and only the king's consent was now wanting.

Charles still resisted, thinking himself incapable of submitting to such a dishonour. He summoned Hollis, Strafford's brother-in-law, who had not taken any part in the prosecution. "What can be done to save him?" said he, with anguish: Hollis advised that Strafford should solicit the king for a reprieve, and that the king should in person lay his petition before both houses, with a speech that Hollis himself wrote immediately: at the same time he promised to do all in his power to persuade his friends to be satisfied with the earl's perpetual exile: and having thus ar-

[g] May 7th, 1641; Clarendon, History of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 161; Whitelocke, p. 43; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 786, 787.

[h] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 737.

[i] May 7th, 1641; ibid.

ranged, they parted. It was believed that the endeavours of Hollis had already met with some success, but the queen, who had always been an enemy to Strafford, frightened by the riots that daily became more numerous, and by the hints of some of her confidants, who said that to save his life he had engaged to reveal all he knew of her intrigues, came and beset the king with her suspicions and terrors [k]: her alarm was so great that she wished to embark for France, and was already making preparations for her departure [l]. Agitated by the tears of his wife, and incapable of deciding for himself, Charles first assembled a privy council, and then the bishops. Juxon, bishop of London, was the only one who counselled him to obey his conscience; all the others, Williams, bishop of Lincoln, in particular, an intriguing prelate, who had long opposed the court, urged him to sacrifice an individual to the throne, his conscience as a man to his conscience as a king [m]. As he retired from this conference, a letter from Strafford was delivered to him [n], in which he said, that after a long struggle he had taken the only proper resolution; that all private interest ought to give way to the happiness of the king's sacred person, and that of the state; and he entreated him to take his life and thus

[k] Burnet's History of His Own Times, vol. i. p. 62, 63, 64, in the Collection.

[l] See a letter of M. De Montreuil, a French minister, dated the 23rd of May, 1641, published by Mr. Mazure in his History of the Revolution of 1688, vol. iii. p. 422, 428.

[m] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 154, 155, 156.

[n] May 9th, 1641.

remove the obstacle which prevented a happy concord between him and his subjects. He continued: "My consent will more acquit you to God than all the world can do besides. To a willing man there is no injury. By God's grace, I forgive all the world with a calmness and meekness of infinite contentment to my dislodging soul." He then begged him to grant as much kindness to his son and his three daughters as their unfortunate father should one day be judged worthy of by posterity, according as he should one day appear innocent or guilty [o].

The next day, secretary Carleton was sent to inform Strafford of the fatal consent the king had given to the bill [p]. The earl seemed surprised, and raising his hands to heaven, he exclaimed, *Put not your trust in princes, nor in the sons of men, for in them there is no salvation* [q].

The king, instead of going personally to beg a reprieve of the commons, as he had promised Hollis he would do, satisfied himself with sending a letter to them by the prince of Wales, concluding with a postscript, in which he said, "If he must die, it would be a charity to spare him till Saturday." The houses read it twice, and, without noticing this cold request, ordered the execution for the next day [r].

The governor of the Tower, who was to accompany Strafford [s], advised him to take a car-

[o] State Trials, vol. iii. col. 1516—1517.
[p] May 10th, 1641.
[q] Whitelocke, p. 44.
[r] May 11th, 1641.
[s] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 760.

riage, to save himself from the violence of the people: "No," answered he, "I know how to look death in the face, and the people also. So that I do not escape is enough for you; but for my part, whether I die by the hand of the executioner, or by the rage of those people, if it please them, nothing can be more indifferent to me:" and he went out on foot, preceding the guards, and looking around him as if he had been at the head of his soldiers. As he passed the place where Laud was confined, he stopped; on the eve he had begged him to be at the window, and bless him as he passed: "My lord," said he, "I entreat your blessing and your prayers." The hoary primate held his arms out towards him, but, incapable of the firmness of his friend, he fell back senseless. "Farewell, my lord," said Strafford, as he moved on, "may God protect your innocence!" When he reached the scaffold he did not hesitate to ascend, followed by his brother, the priests, and several of his friends; he knelt down an instant, then rose and addressed himself to the people. He said he wished the kingdom every prosperity, that it had been his only endeavour in life, and was his only desire in death. But he begged those who listened to him to examine seriously whether the shedding of innocent blood was a good omen for the intended reformation. "However," he said, "God forbid that one drop of my blood should be required at your hands; but I fear you have chosen the wrong path." He knelt down again,

and prayed for a quarter of an hour; then he took leave of the friends who attended him, shaking hands with them, and giving all of them some advice. "And now," said he, "I have nigh done! one stroke will make my wife a widow, my dear children fatherless, deprive my poor servants of their indulgent master, and separate me from my affectionate brother and all my friends! But let God be to you and them all in all!" As he prepared to disrobe he added, "I thank God that I am nowise afraid of death, nor am daunted by any terrors; but do as cheerfully lay down my head at this time as ever I did when going to repose." He called the executioner, forgave him, prayed an instant, then laid his head on the block, and gave the signal himself. His head fell at one blow; the executioner held it up to the people, saying, "God save the king!" Violent acclamations filled the air; the multitude spread in every street of the city, celebrating their victory with loud shouts; others retired silently and apart, filled with doubt and uneasiness as to the justice of the wish they had just seen fulfilled[s].

Disturbed by this impression, the commons did all in their power to repress it; nothing irritates the conqueror so much as to find that a dead enemy is a danger. Mr. Taylor, who had said in a private conversation that it was a murder committed with the sword of justice, was

[s] State Trials, vol. iii. col. 1521; Warwick's Memoirs, p. 146, in the Collection.

sent to the Tower, expelled the house, and declared incapable of ever taking his seat again[t]. Lord Digby had published his speech against the bill of attainder; the house forbade its circulation, and had it burnt by the hand of the common hangman[u]. Never had their strength appeared so great, nor so firmly established; the king in consenting to the death of the earl, had, almost inadvertently adopted the bill which deprived him of the right of dissolving parliament without their own consent. Yet the commons wanted security; and the more their power increased, the more they felt inclined to tyranny. The king in giving Strafford up to them, had lowered himself in their eyes, without removing their suspicions; and a deeper hatred still heightened their mistrust. A royalist party, besides that of the court, was beginning to be formed amongst them. Pym, Hampden, and Hollis, were obliged to ally themselves more and more with the sectaries; and this alliance displeased even the warmest friends of liberty. Why, they asked, should political reform be encumbered with doubtful questions? In matters of worship and discipline, opinions differed; but against arbitrary power, all England was unanimous; it was the only enemy that every one had to pursue without mercy[x]. Sometimes this advice

[t] May 27th, 1641; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 815.

[u] July 13th, 1641; ibid. col. 754, 882.

[x] May, Hist. of the Long Parl. vol. i. p. 223, 227, in the Collection.

prevailed, and the house with one accord again betook themselves to the examination of grievances. The abolition of the star chamber, of the north court, the court of high commission, and of all arbitrary tribunals was definitively agreed to, and the king, after two days' hesitation, also gave his consent[y]. Political reformation, such, at least, as had at first been wished for and conceived, now seemed to be accomplished; but what was the use of having passed it into a statute, if the execution of it was to be entrusted to its greatest enemies. The king's delays and hesitations, reports of plots and defections perceived or suspected in the army and the parliament, awakened new alarms; the parliamentary leaders thought that if they suffered the power they now possessed to pass out of their hands they should be ruined, as well as the cause they defended; to preserve their power the help of the people was necessary; and the people, devoted to the presbyterians, claimed also a share of the triumph. Motions against the church re-appeared; the Scots even began openly to solicit for uniformity of worship in the two nations. But these attempts failed; and this failure increasing the perplexity into which both houses were thrown by so many passions and unconnected designs, gave to their proceedings the appearance of weariness and uncertainty, out of which some promised themselves rest. But the religious struggle became daily more violent,

[y] July 5th, 1641; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col 853—855.

the sectaries grew bolder and the church weaker. Even in the upper house, where she had most friends, every thing attested her decline: the spiritual lords were no longer, according to ancient custom, mentioned separately at the head of the bills; when a bill was read, the speaker affected to turn his back to the seats of the bishops, and in public ceremonies the temporal lords assumed the precedence[z]. These symptoms did not escape the observation of the presbyterian party, who, incessantly renewing their attacks, prevailed with the political reformers, whom they maintained in the possession of power, and, notwithstanding their apparent misfortunes, daily advanced their own success.

The king, all at once, remembered his project of visiting Scotland, where, he said, the treaty of peace, which was, at last, on the point of being concluded, called for his presence. At the same time the news spread abroad, that the queen, giving the state of her health as a pretext, was preparing to depart for the continent. The king on his road would find the disaffected army; and the queen's connections with the continent had long been suspicious. These intended journeys, simultaneous and unexpected, gave the distrustful the occasion they wanted. Their suspicions were not without foundation. Charles, without influence or power in London, surrounded by useless courtiers and timid coun-

[z] Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. ii. pp. 410, 411.

sellors, had turned his thoughts towards the kingdom of his fathers, and towards the absolute monarchs of Europe. In Scotland he intended to gain the good-will of the people by giving way in all matters concerning the crown or the church, and to win the lords by loading them with favours: he thought also that his passage through the army and his behaviour towards it could but add to the number of his partisans. As to the continent, his views were not very clear; yet without foreseeing or even imagining war, he already sought money and allies. The commons did not mention their suspicions; but they begged that the queen would not leave London, and that it would please the king to defer his departure[a]. Charles manifested some displeasure, and affected to look upon this request as an unreasonable caprice. To show that he attached no importance to it he referred the commons for an answer to the queen herself, and to the Scottish commissioners, who, he said, solicited him to hasten his journey. The Scots willingly agreed to a delay, and the queen graciously promised not to depart[b]. The fears of the commons were for a while quieted; and they now anxiously urged the disbanding of the army, which had hitherto been purposely delayed. Letters from the house promised the troops early payment; and to ensure its fulfilment some zealous citizens had their plate melted; fresh

[a] June 26th, 1641.

[b] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 846, 851, 852, 885, 890.

loans were ordered, and new taxes imposed[a]. Yet the army were but slowly paid off, from the want of money, and through the ill-will of many of the officers[b]. This secretly pleased the king; but drove the commons back to their fears. The delay which had been agreed upon had now expired. The commons solicited another, but without success[c]; the king announced that he was about to depart. That business might not be suspended, they thought of requesting the nomination of a protector of the kingdom in the king's absence; but this idea had no result[d]. The king merely named the earl of Essex captain-general south of the Trent, and departed on the 10th of August, betraying by his discourse hopes of which none could imagine the foundation.

The house soon discovered that they only lost time by sitting uncertain and inactive in his absence. It was much more important to them to watch narrowly their adversaries and kindle the zeal of their partisans in the counties. After a fortnight of unimportant sittings, they resolved to adjourn[e]. Many of the members wished to attend to their own private concerns, or to enjoy some repose; but the leaders allowed themselves

[a] May, Hist. of the Long Parl. vol. i. p. 206; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 841—843. The interest demanded for this loan was fixed at ten per cent.

[b] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 209.

[c] August 8th, 1641; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 897, 899.

[d] Ibid. col. 892.

[e] August 27th, 1641. The recess was to last from the 8th of September to the 20th of October; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 904.

no rest. A committee, directed by Hampden, was sent to Scotland, to remain near the king, and watch over the interests of parliament[f]. Another committee, of which Pym was chairman, sat at Westminster in the interval of the two sessions. The house of lords took the same measures[g]. A great many members went into the country; anxious to propagate their feelings and their fears. Both parties, under the appearance of a truce, were seeking more strength, for both meditated future contests.

In passing through the English army, which was disbanding, and the Scottish army, which was returning home, the king dared not tarry long. Still his attempts among the soldiers, particularly among the officers, were public enough to induce lord Holland, who presided over the payment of the troops, to write a letter full of alarm to the earl of Essex[h], adding, that on his return he would tell him more. When he arrived at Edinburgh, Charles granted all the concessions requested by the church and parliament of Scotland: a law for triennial parliaments, the resignation of the ancient prerogatives of the crown, prosecutions against the principal opponents of the covenant, and even the intervention of parliament in the choice

Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 902. This committee was composed of six members, namely the earl of Bedford, lord Howard, Sir William Armyn, Sir Philip Stapleton, Nathaniel Fiennes, and Hampden.

[g] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 910.

[h] August 16th, 1641; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 210.

of a privy council; nothing was refused. The king, in so earnest a manner that it did not appear a condecension, complied in every thing with the presbyterians, assisting at their frequent prayers, and listening attentively to their tedious sermons: whether laymen or clergymen, noblemen or citizens, the covenanters were treated with officious zeal; offices, titles, promises, and pensions were lavished upon them.

On a sudden, two of the most influential noblemen in parliament, lord Hamilton and lord Argyle, fled from the town, followed by their friends, and took refuge at Kinneil castle, the residence of the earl of Lanark[1], Hamilton's brother, to escape from the danger of an arrest and even an assasination. This occasioned great astonishment, every one inquired what could have excited such fears in the fugitives, or have induced the king to such designs. Strange conjectures were entertained; the king haughtily complained of them as an insult to him, and requested of the parliament that Hamilton should be expelled till his honour was avenged. The parliament, wary and resolute, refused to give any sudden decision, and voted that an inquiry should be made. Many witnesses were examined; the committee made their report; it was declared, without any explanations, that there was no need of any reparation to the king, and that the fugitives had nothing to fear. They returned to parliament,

[1] In the beginning of October, 1641.

remained silent on what had passed, Charles did the same, and the public knew no more.

Neither party wished that they should; but every thing had been explained to them. During the time that the king by the grant of so many concessions seemed resolved to win over the Scots, in order to employ them against the English, he had meditated the ruin of his enemies in both kingdoms. Convinced that the judges could do no other than condemn as treason the correspondence of the English malecontents with the Scottish covenanters, which had preceded and perhaps caused the last invasion, he went himself to discover the proofs; purposing to bring against the commons that accusation which Strafford had not been able even to announce. The earl of Montrose[k], a bold and youthful nobleman, who had been a friend to the covenant, but was now returned to the king's favour, had engaged to procure the long wished for documents. Depending upon his promise, Charles had departed for Scotland; but, before he arrived, a letter in hieroglyphics, which was intercepted by Argyle, had excited suspicion in the Scots, and the king found Montrose in prison. The earl, animated by danger and longing for revenge, sent word that if he could see him he would acquaint him with his real enemies and their past conspiracies. Montrose, with the assistance of a few who were initiated in the secret,

[k] James Gordon, earl of Montrose, (Montross) born at Edinburgh in 1612.

clandestinely left his prison by night, went to the king's bedchamber and told him of every thing he knew. He accused Hamilton as well as Argyle of having taken a part in the plans of the malecontents, assured the king that their papers would furnish an ample proof of this, and persuaded him to have these noblemen immediately put in his power, and even to destroy them if they resisted. Charles eager to accept these daring proposals, and without thinking what effect such violent measures would be likely to produce on the minds of the people whom he was seeking to captivate, gave his consent to every thing; the plot was contrived under the appearance of concessions, and every thing was ready for its execution, when the two lords, warned in time of their danger, caused the whole to fail by their sudden departure [1].

The Scottish parliament were wisely advised to put an end to the affair; they no longer feared the peril, and did not wish to endanger what they had just obtained, by keeping up the contest. The king himself, to conceal his designs and their want of success, gave Hamilton the title of duke, Argyle that of marquis; and created Lesley earl of Leven; but Hampden and the English committee, who were well informed of

[1] Hardwicke's State Papers, vol. ii. p. 299; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 224; Burnet, Memoirs of the Hamiltons, p. 148—171; Baillie's Letters, vol. i. p. 329, 327, 330, 331, 332; Malcolm Laing, Hist. of Scotland, vol. iii. p. 228, and in the note p. 347—555. Brodie, Hist. of the British Empire, etc. vol. iii. p. 142, 156.

all that had passed, hastened to write of it to London, where the adjourned parliament were about to meet. The party were struck with fear[m]. Notwithstanding their suspicions they had not foreseen dangers like these; and the leaders thought their ancient connections with the Scottish insurgents had been fully wiped away, as well as the rebellion itself, by the last treaty of peace. Men who were otherwise moderate, at this symptom of the king's obstinate and vindictive intentions, thought themselves in danger and for ever compromised. Mr. Hyde meeting with lord Essex and lord Holland, who were talking over the news with an air of great alarm, laughed at their fears and reminded them of what they themselves thought of Hamilton and Argyle a year ago: "Every thing is very much altered since that," they replied, "both the court and the country[n]." The very next day[o], the commons requested that a guard should be given them, which they said was become indispensable to the safety of parliament. Essex immediately granted it. In conferences held at lord Holland's at Kensington, the leaders of both houses communicated their suspicions and the news they had heard to each other, and considered together what was best to be done; all were disturbed, and impelled by their fears to dare every thing. "If

[m] Evelyn's Memoirs, vol. ii. Append. p. 40, 46; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 914, 915.

[n] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 226.

[o] October 20th, 1641.

the king," said lord Newport, "contrive such plots as these against us, his wife and children are here[p];" and their alarms were the greater, because they dared not make use of them to move the people; for nothing had transpired in Scotland, and in England nothing could be revealed.

In the midst of this hidden agitation the news arrived[q] of a general and violent insurrection in Ireland, which had filled that country with massacres, and threatened parliament and the protestant religion with the most imminent danger. The Irish catholics, leaders and people, were everywhere in arms, claiming liberty for their worship and their country, calling on the name of the queen, and even of the king, showing a commission which they had, as they said, received from him, and announcing their project of delivering themselves and the king from the English puritans their common oppressors. This conspiracy had for a long time been planning all over the kingdom, and was only by chance betrayed at Dublin[r] on the eve of its explosion, where there was scarcely time to repress it. Everywhere else it met with but little obstacle; on all sides the protestants were attacked unawares, driven from their houses and possessions, exposed to all the perils and torments that fanatical and national hatred could invent against

[p] Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 984; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 220, 221.

[q] November, 1st, 1641.

[r] October 22nd, 1641.

heretics, foreigners, and tyrants. Horrible and lamentable accounts of their distress reached England, their unspeakable sufferings in the innumerable deaths; the evil was indeed so great, that it might be exaggerated according to the fears or projects of any, without offending truth or exhausting credulity[s]. An uncivilised and half wild nation, endeared to that barbarous state which their oppressors made a reproach to them, yet from which they took care not to emancipate them, had seized with delight the hope of deliverance which the dissentions of these oppressors offered them. Desirous to avenge in one day the wrongs and misfortunes of ages, they with pride and exultation committed excesses which struck their ancient masters with terror and dismay. The English authorities had no means of resistance; the parliament in their hatred for Strafford and the crown, and solely occupied by the design of establishing liberty in England, had forgotten that in Ireland they wanted to maintain tyranny.

[s] May, (Hist. of the Long. Parl.) estimates the number of protestants who were massacred at two hundred thousand; Clarendon reduces it to forty or fifty thousand, (Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 227.) It is probable from the correspondence of the judges who then resided in Ireland, and the inquiry made in 1644 on this subject that this last account is exaggerated. Yet this investigation, which Mr. Lingard (Hist. of England, vol. x. note A. p. 463, 469,) considers as decisive, deserves no attention; not only was it made three years after the explosion, but at an epoch when the royalist party reigned absolute in Ireland, and had just made peace with the catholics; the object of it was evidently to soften as much as possible the excesses of the insurgents and the sufferings of the protestants, and thus to excuse the alliance which the king was on the point of contracting.

The treasury was exhausted, martial law abolished, the army reduced to a feeble corps, and royal power disarmed. The disbanded Irish troops, contrary to the king's wish, were even forbidden to pass into foreign service [t]; they had spread about the country, lending their force to the insurrection. Though the earl of Leicester had been appointed successor to Strafford, the new viceroy had not yet gone over to Ireland; affairs were entrusted to two judges who possessed neither capacity nor influence [u], and whose presbyterian zeal had alone caused them to be entrusted with so difficult a charge.

A furious outcry against popery was raised by fear and rage all over England; every protestant thought himself in danger. The king, who had received this news in Scotland, hastened to communicate it to the two houses; informing them at the same time of some measures, which, with the help of the Scots, he had already taken to repress the rebellion, and that he entrusted the whole affair to the care of parliament [x]. Charles had taken no part in the insurrection, and the pretended commission produced by Sir Phelim O'Neil was a gross forgery: but the king's well known hatred for the puritans, the confidence he had more than once shown that he placed in the papists, the intrigues that for the

[t] Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 381; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 196.

[u] Sir William Parsons, and Sir John Borlase.

[x] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 229.

last three months he had carried on in Ireland, to retain strong holds and soldiers in case of need in that country[y], in short, the queen's promises, had persuaded the Irish that they might, without fearing a sincere denial, make use of the king's name. While Ireland was in this state of rebellion, Charles hoped so great a danger would render the parliament more submissive; and without upholding the rebels, or dreaming of an alliance with them, he was not, like his people, struck with fear and anger at their rebellion; he took no measures to repress it, but gave up the affair to parliament that they might be responsible for all mischances, and to do away with any suspicion of connivance; perhaps also he thought by so doing to exculpate himself in the eyes of his catholic snbjects from the blame of the hardships they would have to undergo.

But every sort of cunning fails against the passions of the people; and those who will not serve these passions cannot deceive them. The leaders of the commons, more skilful and better situated, only thought of employing them to their own benefit. All their uneasiness had now disappeared, for the English people thought themselves fallen into a peril analogous to their

[y] Carte, Life of Ormond, vol. i. p. 132, vol. iii. p. 30, 33 Clarendon, State Papers, vol. ii. p. 337; Antrim's information in the appendix of the History of the Irish Rebellion, by Clarendon The testimony given by Antrim does not however, in my opinion deserve the confidence placed in it by Mr. Lingard, (Hist. of England vol. x. p. 150, 154,) and Mr. Godwin, (Hist. of the Commonwealth, vol. i. p. 220—225.)

own. Eagerly did the parliament accept the power offered them by the king, and notwithstanding the display of their declarations and the violence of their threats, the care of repressing the rebellion occupied them but little; the assistance, both as regards troops and money, sent to Ireland, was weak, slow, and ill-concerted: all their actions and speeches were addressed to England alone, and by a proceeding as decisive as it was unexpected, they resolved to engage the nation for ever.

A short time after the opening of parliament, a committee had been appointed, charged to prepare a general remonstrance, in which all the grievances of the kingdom should be exposed, and the means of redressing them pointed out. But the reform had been so rapid that the committee had neglected to attach much importance to the complaints: most of the political grievances had disappeared, the committee had neglected its duty, and no one appeared to think any more about it.

It now suddenly received orders to renew its labours, and to make a report without delay[z]. In a few days the remonstrance was written and laid before the house. It was no longer, according to the first intention, an exposition of pressing and actual abuses, and of the unanimous wishes of the country, but a dark picture of past evils and ancient grievances, a recapitulation of

[z] Towards the beginning of November, 1641; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 231.

all the king's faults, and of all the merits of parliament, the obstacles they had surmounted, the perils they had encountered, and particularly those which threatened them still and impelled them to make a final effort; in fact, a sort of appeal to the people, but more especially to the fanatical presbyterians, which, inflaming the passions that the Irish rebellion had rekindled, excited them to devote themselves unreservedly to the commons, who were alone capable of preserving them from popery, the bishops, and the king.

When this project was first read, many were the murmurs that rose against it; an act so hostile, without any direct or apparent aim, excited in many members, who had not till then been friendly to the court, both surprise and suspicion; they complained of the bitterness of language, the useless anger against grievances already redressed; of the rudeness shown to the king, and the hopes held out to the sectaries. What could be the hidden designs, the unknown perils that required such violent measures? If the remonstrance was destined for the king alone, what good could be expected from it? If addressed to the people, by what right did they thus appeal to them? The party leaders answered but little; all their reasons could not be told; but in their conversations they ardently applied themselves to gain approbation, protesting that they only wanted to intimidate the court and frustrate their intrigues; let but the

remonstrance be adopted, they said, and it should not be published. This language was not without effect, for suspicions were now so general that men who were otherwise of a moderate disposition received them, as soon as they were expressed, with gentleness and moderation. In a few days[a], at the moment the house, after a sitting of several hours, were about to retire, the leaders requested that the remonstrance should be immediately voted; they had reckoned their numbers and thought themselves sure of success; but lord Falkland, Hyde, Colepepper, and Palmer, opposed it, strongly insisting that it should be deferred till the next day, to which the house willingly assented. "Why," said Cromwell to lord Falkland, "are you so tenacious about this delay?" "Because it is too late to-day, and that there will surely be a debate." "A *little* debate," answered Cromwell, with a tone of real or affected security. The next day the debate opened at three o'clock in the afternoon, and when night came on it seemed scarcely begun. It was no longer the court in presence of the country; for the first time two parties were engaged, if not both national, at least risen alike from the midst of the nation; both upheld by public interests and feelings, both reckoning worthy and independent citizens among their followers. The same hopes had united them; they were now divided by opposite fears: each

[a] November 21st, 1641

keenly foresaw the destiny which would follow the triumph of their adversaries, and mistook that which their own victory would bring. They struggled with unparalleled animosity, and were the more obstinate inasmuch as they still observed decorum, and dared not openly accuse each other according to the extent of their suspicions. It grew late; fatigue obliged the weak, the old, and the indifferent, to depart; even one of the king's ministers, the secretary of state, Nicholas, left the house before the end of the debate. "This," said Sir Benjamin Rudyard, "will be the verdict of a starving jury." Towards midnight the house divided: one hundred and fifty-nine appeared for the remonstrance, one hundred and forty-eight against it. Hampden directly rose and proposed that it should be printed. "We knew it!" many cried, "We knew it! you want to raise the people and free yourselves of the concurrence of the lords." "The house," said Mr. Hyde, "is not in the habit of thus publishing its decisions; in my opinion this is illegal, and will become fatal; if it be adopted, let me be allowed to protest." "I protest," said Mr. Palmer; "I protest, I protest!" echoed from the voices of all their friends. On the other side, astonishment and indignation prevailed; the right of protest, long possessed by the lords, had never been heard of in the commons: Pym rose to demonstrate the illegality and the danger of it, but he was interrupted by invectives: he still persisted, and

was answered by threats. The whole house was in confusion, and several members, their hands on their swords, seemed on the point of beginning a civil war within the walls of parliament. Two hours passed away, and the tumult was renewed every time a resolution was on the point of being adopted. At last Hampden, with mildness and gravity, deplored that these humiliating riots should have taken place, and proposed that the question should be adjourned till the afternoon. They separated; "Well," said lord Falkland to Cromwell, as he was going out, "was there not a debate?" "I'll believe you another time," said Cromwell; and, bending towards his ear, he added, "had the remonstrance been thrown out, I would, to-morrow, have sold every thing I possess, and have left England for ever; and I know a great many honest folks who would have done the same[b]."

The meeting that evening was not much agitated; the royalists had given up all hope of victory, and their adversaries had seen themselves so near the point of losing it, that they cared but little to renew the struggle. They had announced the intention of bringing to trial those who had protested; but Mr. Hyde had friends among them who refused to give him up; and Mr. Palmer, who had been sent to the

[b] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 246—250; Warwick's Memoirs, p. 168, in the Collection; May, Hist. of the Long Parl. vol. i. p. 225—259, ibid.; Rushworth, part 3. vol. ii. p. 425—428; Whitelocke, p. 49.

Tower, was almost immediately released. After some explanations, the quarrel was made up. A majority of twenty-three voices ordered the remonstrance to be printed[c]: yet the printing was delayed, as it was first necessary to present it to the king, who was now daily expected.

He arrived, haughty and confident[d], notwithstanding the check he had received in Scotland, and notwithstanding what he knew of the disposition of parliament. Everywhere, as he passed, but particularly at York, he was received with loud acclamations of joy and affection. In many places his concessions to the Scots had delighted the people; while his secret plans were but little known, or, misunderstood. Besides, in the country, as well as in parliament, a royalist party was forming, which even in London numbered many adherents. The king's friends had caused Richard Gourney, an active and courageous man, who was devoted to the king, to be elected lord mayor, who prepared a most brilliant reception to welcome Charles to his capital. A multitude of citizens on horseback, armed, and bearing the banners of the various companies, went to meet him, and escorted him with acclamations to the palace of Whitehall. The king in return gave them a magnificent repast, and conferred the honour of knighthood

[c] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 250; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 937.

[d] November 25th, 1641.

on the lord mayor and several of the aldermen[e]; and the day after his arrival, anxious to let the commons see that he thought himself powerful, he took away from them the guard which in his absence the earl of Essex had appointed for their safety[f].

The appearance of affairs was now changed; party dissensions had succeeded to that unanimity which had at first prevailed, and reform was followed by revolution. The leaders perceived it and their conduct suddenly assumed a different character. The remonstrance was presented to the king[g]; he patiently listened to it; and then, addressing himself to the committee, he asked; "Does the house intend to publish this declaration?" "We are not authorised to answer any of your majesty's questions," was the reply. "Well, I suppose you do not want my answer neither immediately; I will send it to you as soon as the importance of the subject will permit[h]." The leaders of the commons cared little for his decision; without waiting for any answer, they all at once brought forward projects that the remonstrance did not so much as hint at. Thus far they had redressed grievances, by appealing to ancient laws; now they proclaimed principles and imperiously de-

[e] Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 429—434; May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. i. p. 253, in the Collection; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 267; Whitelocke, p. 48; Evelyn's Memoirs, Append., vol. ii. p. 79.

[f] November 26th, 1641; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 940.

[g] December 1st, 1641. [h] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 942, 943.

manded innovations. A bill was under debate for the levying of troops destined for Ireland; in the preamble it was stated, "that in no case, except that of a foreign invasion, could the king order his subjects to be pressed for military service, the right being incompatible with their freedom!" Another bill was proposed purporting that the organisation of the militia and the nomination of its officers should for the future only take place with the consent and advice of parliament[k]. The bill which excluded all ecclesiastics from civil offices[l] had, a few days before the king's return, through the influence of the presbyterians, been again brought forward and adopted; but the lords paused, and of this the commons angrily complained. "We are," said they, "the representatives of the whole kingdom; the peers are but individuals vested with a prerogative merely personal. If your lordships refuse to agree to that which is necessary for the welfare of the people, the commons in conjunction with those lords who feel for the dangers of the people, will address themselves alone to his majesty; and the popular noblemen, the earls of Northumberland, Essex, and Warwick, did not even protest against such discourse[m]. Out of the

[l] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 273; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 969; May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. i. p. 285, in the Collection.

[k] December 7th, 1641; May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. i. p. 297; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 280, 284.

[l] October 23rd, 1641; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 916.

[m] Journals of the House of Commons, December 3rd, 1641.

house the party rallied round their leaders in the like manner; the remonstrance was published[n]. The city declared that in receiving the king so pompously the citizens of London had not meant to betray their true friends, and that they would live and die for the parliament[o]. The apprentices drew up a petition enumerating commercial grievances, imputing them to the papists, the bishops, and the king's bad counsellors[p]. In the counties, associations were formed devoted to the defence of their liberty and creed. From all sides the commons were supported; sinister reports excited new motives for adhesion; it was said the life of Pym was threatened, and that the Irish rebels were preparing an invasion; a mysterious visit, a word heard by chance in the street, was enough for plots to be denounced and solemn oaths of union taken; and while the commons daily demanded that their guard should be restored, the multitude daily assembled round Westminster formed one, and loudly proclaimed their common dangers.

Against these bold pretensions, maintained by such tumultuous passions, Charles, on his side, rallied all his partisans; the interested servants of absolute power, the loyal defenders of the king, whatever be his cause, and those citizens, who having opposed tyranny were brought back

[n] September 14th, 1641; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 970.

[o] May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. i. p. 260, in the Collection.

[p] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 286; Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 462.

to the monarch by the fear of excesses and innovations. These last were the only ones who composed the royalist party in the house of commons, lord Falkland, Mr. Hyde, and Sir John Colepepper, were the leaders; and Charles resolved to bind them to his interests. Before his journey into Scotland, the king had already held secret interviews with Hyde; and by the respectful wisdom of his advice, by his aversion to all innovations, and in particular through his devotion to the church, Hyde had gained his confidence[q]. Lord Falkland he did not like so well; he despised the court, and cared but little for the king, whom he had not sought since he had separated himself from the innovators, and these he had opposed more to defend injured justice than to serve the king's threatened prerogative. Charles feared him, and did not feel at ease in his presence; but he was impelled by necessity. Hyde, who was his most intimate friend, undertook to negotiate with him. Falkland at first refused; his scrupulous virtue estranged him from the abettors of revolution; but his principles, his wishes, and the emotions of his rather dreaming imagination, were continually prompting him to join the friends of liberty. He alleged his antipathy to court, his inability to serve it, and his resolution of never employing either falsehood, corruption, or spies, "useful, perhaps necessary means," said he, "but with which I shall not soil my hands."

[q] Clarendon, Memoirs, vol. i. p. 122, in the Collection.

Surprised and piqued at having to entreat one of his subjects, Charles nevertheless persisted. Hyde expatiated upon the great injury his refusal would be to the king. Falkland was at last persuaded, though disheartened beforehand and feeling himself the victim of a self-devotion, to which neither hope nor affection prompted him. He was appointed secretary of state. Colepepper, who was much less influential, but distinguished for his boldness and the ready resources of his mind in controversy was created lord high chancellor. Hyde alone, contrary to the king's wish, obstinately refused any office; not through fear, but through prudence, judging that he should be able to serve the king much better in maintaining the exterior independence of his position. The three friends undertook to govern Charles's affairs in the house, and Charles promised to do nothing without their counsel[r].

At the same time, other friends, not so useful but more eager, hastened from all parts of the kingdom to defend his honour and his life, threatened, as they said, by the parliament. Notwithstanding the fall of the feudal system, the feelings it had engendered still animated a great many of the gentry. They lived inactive in their country seats, and were but little given to reflection or accustomed to debate. They despised those talkative and cavilling citizens whose rigid creed

[r] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 297, etc.; Memoirs, vol. i. p. 129, in the Collection; Warwick's Memoirs, vol. i. p. 162, ibid.

forbade the use of wine, games, and all the pleasures of old England; and who assumed to govern the king though their fathers had not even had the honour to serve him. Exalted by the recollection of their own independence, they cared little about the new wants of public liberty. With the people they had murmured against tyranny; but after so many concessions from the king, their loyalty and improvidence rendered them indignant at the insolence and obstinacy of the innovators. They arrived in London armed, and walked the streets proudly, visited the taverns and often went to Whitehall to offer their services or to solicit some favour from the king. There, others, not impelled by such genuine good-will, and still less clear-sighted, joined them,—those officers whom their discharge had left without pay or employment, most of them soldiers of fortune, tutored in the continental wars, dissolute, servile, and bold; irritated against the parliament, who had taken their trade from them, against the people who detested their morals, and ready to do any thing for any master who would please to employ them, no matter in what cause—young lawyers, students in the Temple, patronised by the court, anxious to take part in its pleasures, or to give a proof of high birth or elegance by embracing its cause, swelled the restless and presumptuous throng who daily assembled round Whitehall, inveighing against the commons, and insulting all who took part with them, lavishing their boast-

ings and railleries, and anxiously hoping that the king, or some chance, might speedily give them an opportunity of making their fortune by proving their loyalty[s].

The popular party were no less impatient to give them this opportunity; the mob every day became more numerous and agitated. Crowds of apprentices, workmen, and women, went in the morning from the city to Westminster, and in passing by Whitehall the shouts "no bishops! no papist lords!" were more furious than ever. Sometimes they stopped, and one of them would get upon a step and there read to the multitude the names of the 'perverse members of the house of commons,' or those of 'the treacherous and corrupted lords.' They carried their audaciousness so far as to request that there should be no sentinel at the gates of the palace, for they said they would see the king at any hour, whenever they pleased[t]. Violent quarrels soon took place; the names of cavaliers and roundheads distinguished the two parties; the citizens at first looking upon their appellation as an insult, though they soon afterwards gloried in it[u]. The cavaliers sought their enemies around Westminster, sometimes to brave them, sometimes to protect the royalists as they re-

[s] Ludlow's Memoirs, vol. i. p. 27, in the Collection.

[t] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 293; May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. i. p. 279, in the Collection; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 986.

[u] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 296; Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 493.

turned from parliament. It was particularly against the upper house that the people's anger raged most furiously, for the lords still held the bill for the exclusion of the bishops in suspense. The archbishop of York, who was going to the house on foot, tried to arrest with his own hands a young man who followed him with insults; the multitude pressed round him and it was with the greatest difficulty that his friends rescued him from their vengeance[x]. Both parties alternately made some prisoners and wrested them from each other again. Blood was spilled; the cavaliers boasted with derision of having dispersed their adversaries; but they returned the next day better armed and more experienced. One evening the tumult without was so great, that the marquis of Hertford drew near the bishops' seats, and advised them not to go out; "for," said he, "those people say they are waiting for you, and that they will examine every carriage, so that you shall not escape them."—"What can we do," replied the bishops, "must we then stay here all night?" "That is very likely," replied some of those who supported the bill for their expulsion. However they did depart; some of them in the carriage of one of the popular lords, others by back passages; even among their friends many began to think their presence was not worth the danger it occasioned[y]. Twice did

[x] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 294; Rushworth, part 3. vol. i. p. 493.

[y] Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 991.

the upper house claim the assistance of the commons that these outrages might be repressed[y]; but the commons remained silent, or only answered by complaints of the cavaliers. "We want all our friends," said the leaders, "God forbid that we should prevent the people from obtaining their reasonable wishes[z]." The lords applied to the magistrates, requesting that these riots should be proceeded against according to the laws; and upon an order, to which was affixed the great seal, the justices of peace enjoined the constables to place a guard round Westminster to disperse the mob. The commons sent for the constables, treated the order they had received as a breach of privilege, and sent one of the justices to the Tower[a]. At the same time, the house voted that as the king still refused them any guard each member should be authorised to bring one servant with him armed as he might think the occasion required.

These riots, this unmanageable disorder, overwhelmed the king with anger and fear; never in the time of his greatest apprehensions, had such scenes entered his imagination; he was astonished and indignant that royalty should have endured such gross insults; and it was no longer for his power alone, but for the safety, at least the dignity of his person and life, that he began to be alarmed. The queen, still more agitated, assailed him with her fears; his pride as a mon-

[y] From the 20th to the 30th of December, 1641.

[z] Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 986. [a] Ibid. col. 987.

arch and his tenderness as a husband could not suffer the idea that peril or insult should threaten the object of his affections, the partner of his rank. Seeking on all sides some support against the multitude, and some means of preventing or punishing their excesses, he resolved to dismiss the governor of the Tower, Sir William Balfour, who was devoted to the commons, and to put a bold and trusty man in his place. Three thousand pounds, the produce of the sale of some of the queen's jewels, were given to Sir William to quiet his displeasure. Sir Thomas Lunsford, one of the most audacious leaders among the cavaliers who assembled at Whitehall, was appointed to succeed him [b]. At the same time, the king assumed a more haughty tone towards the parliament, endeavouring, in his turn, to intimidate them. Hyde had prepared a clever and firm answer to the remonstrance; Charles adopted it and had it published in his name [c]. The bill for the impressment of soldiers was still in agitation before the commons; before it was presented to him, Charles, in a solemn declaration, announced that he should only accept it with the omission of that passage in the preamble which deprived him of the power of impressment [d]. Irish affairs made but little progress; he sum-

[b] Towards the 20th of December, 1641; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 284.

[c] Clarendon's Memoirs, vol. i. p. 125, 129, in the Collection; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 970—977.

[d] December 14th, 1641; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 988.

moned the commons to see about them, and offered to raise ten thousand volunteers if the house would promise to pay them [e]. The bishops, on their part, perhaps without the king's consent, assembled to deliberate on their situation. Violence awaited them at the doors of the upper house; they resolved to absent themselves, to state in a protestation the motives of their retreat, and to declare void and useless every bill that should be adopted without the concurrence of every legitimate and necessary member of parliament. Suddenly drawn up, revised, and signed by twelve bishops [f], this protest was immediately presented to the king, who eagerly received it; it encouraged the hope that he might one day, under this pretext, annul the acts of that fatal parliament which he could not subdue. Without saying a word to his new counsellors, whose advice he feared much more than he justly appreciated their influence, he ordered the lord high keeper to carry it on the same day to the upper house, congratulating himself on his dexterity in thus smoothing the future [g].

The lords were astonished beyond expression; they could not believe that twelve bishops, the

December 29th, 1641; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 991.

[f] The archbishop of York, and the bishops of Durham, Lichfield, St. Asaph, Oxford, Bath and Wells, Hereford, Ely, Gloucester, Peterborough, Landaff, and Norwich.

[g] December 30th, 1641; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 993; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 315, 323.

legality of whose parliamentary existence was questioned, should thus pretend to dispose of the destiny of parliament, and to annihilate it by their absence. The protestation was communicated without delay to the commons, and received by them with apparent anger, but at the same time with that secret joy which the faults of an enemy inspire. An impeachment was immediately sent up against the bishops for having endeavoured to subvert the fundamental laws of the kingdom, and to invalidate the authority of parliament[h]. Even their friends remained silent, irritated by their imprudence and perhaps gladly seizing the opportunity to forsake without shame a ruined cause; only one voice rose in their favour, saying, they should be sent to Bedlam, and not before judges[i]. The upper house admitted the justice of the accusation, and they were immediately committed to the Tower. The leaders of the commons, eager to make the most of such a chance, strongly urged all their attacks. They had already complained of the king's declaration on the subject of the press, as being a breach of their privileges, which did not permit that the king should take notice of any bill which was in agitation in either of the houses[k]; they dwelt on the necessity of firmly defending these privileges, their only hope in the midst of so many perils. They highly censured the ap-

[h] Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 994, etc.; Whitelocke, p. 51.

[i] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 315—323.

[k] December 14th, 1641.

pointment of Sir Thomas Lunsford, a man of no repute, without either fortune, religion, or morals, known only by his violence against the people, and capable of the most pernicious designs. Already, they said, the alarm was so great in the city that merchants and foreigners refused to deposit their ingots in the Tower. They demanded the nomination of another governor. Lord Digby, who had become one of the king's most intimate confidants, was impeached for having said the parliament was not free[l]. At last, reports were spread that the queen herself might very probably be accused of high treason[m].

The king seemed to despair; he did nothing in favour of the bishops, took the government of the Tower from Lunsford, and gave it to Sir John Byron, who was greatly esteemed[n], said no more of the riots, nor complained of the last debates. Yet secret reports and vague whispers disturbed the commons. The queen was silent and reserved, yet she seemed animated with some hope; lord Digby, whose daring presumption was well known, visited her frequently and seemed more intimate than ever with her and the king. The number of the cavaliers at Whitehall daily increased. The commons, without explaining their fears, again sent to ask for a guard[o]. The king indirectly answered that he must have

[l] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 969, 982, 1002.
[m] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 326.
[n] Ibid. vol. ii. p. 326.
[o] December 31st, 1641.

a written petition from them. As if certain from this delay that some immediate danger was impending, the commons ordered arms to be brought into the hall. Three days after, the king's answer came; it was a refusal, concluding with these words: "I solemnly promise, on the honour of a king, to preserve you, one and all, from all violence, with as much care as I would take for my own safety and that of my children." But the alarms of the house only increased, and they sent orders to the lord mayor, the sheriffs, and the common council, to keep the London militia standing, and to place strong guards in several parts of the city [p].

On that very day [q], Sir Edward Herbert, attorney-general, went to the house of peers in the king's name to prefer an accusation of high treason against lord Kimbolton and five members of the commons, namely, Hampden, Pym, Hollis, Strode, and Haslerig: first, of having attempted to subvert the fundamental laws of the kingdom, and to deprive the king of his lawful authority; secondly, of having alienated the people from the king by shameful calumnies; thirdly, of having excited the army to disobey the king; fourthly, of having invited and encouraged a foreign power, Scotland, to invade the kingdom; fifthly, of having excited seditious riots against the king and the parliament, for the purpose of obtaining

[p] Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1002, 1004; Rushworth, part 3. vol. i. p. 471; Journals of the House of Commons, January 3rd, 1642.

[q] January 3rd, 1642.

by violence the success of their wicked designs; sixthly, of having aimed at subverting the rights and even the very being of parliaments; lastly, of having levied men and waged war against the king. Sir Edward requested at the same time that a committee should be formed to examine the charges, and that it should please the house to place in safe custody the persons of the accused [q].

The whole house were amazed; no one had foreseen such a transaction, and no one dared to speak first. At last, lord Kimbolton rose, and said he was ready to obey any order of the house; but since his impeachment was public he begged that his justification might be public also; and he sat down again in silence. Lord Digby, who sat next to him, whispered in his ear, "What deplorable counsels are given to the king! I shall be very unlucky if I do not find out whence all this arises." It was asserted that it was he and no other who had persuaded the king to this enterprise, and that he had moreover promised that he himself would demand the immediate arrest of lord Kimbolton, as soon as the attorney-general should have accused him [r].

A message from the lords immediately informed the commons of what had passed; they had just heard that the king's officers were gone to the houses of the five members and were putting seals on every thing that belonged to them.

[q] Rushworth, part 3. vol. i. p. 473—474.

[r] Ibid. p. 474; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 331.

The house voted that all these acts of violence were breaches of privilege, and declared that not only had the accused the right to resist, but that it was the duty of any constable to prevent it, and that the king's officers should be brought to the bar as delinquents. Sir John Hotham was sent to the lords to request an immediate conference, and with orders to declare that if the house of peers refused to join in their demand to obtain a guard from the king, the commons would retire to a safer place. While they were expecting an answer from the lords, a serjeant-at-arms arrived, in the king's name, to seize the five members impeached of high treason, requesting the speaker to deliver them up to him. The accused were present, but not one offered to move, and the speaker ordered the serjeant-at-arms to retire. Without any tumult or opposition the house appointed a committee to go, while the members still sat, and tell the king that so important a message could only be answered after a solemn deliberation. Two ministers, lord Falkland and Sir John Colepepper, although they were ignorant of the whole transaction, formed part of the committee. The conference with the lords was opened, and in less than an hour an order was made to remove the seals, and a petition for a guard was sent to the king by the duke of Richmond, one of the least dishonest of his favourites. The king replied that he would give an answer on the morrow; and the commons adjourned to the next

day at one o'clock, ordering the accused to attend at Westminster as well as all the other members[s].

The next day[t], when the commons met, their anger and uneasiness were evidently increased; a presentiment of some unknown but certain danger filled the minds of all. The royalists sat silent and sorrowful; among their adversaries a thousand reports were in active circulation, some collected on the eve, others in the night, and even on that very morning: it was said that the cavaliers had assembled, that the king had sent them orders to be ready; that two barrels of gunpowder and some arms had been carried from the Tower to Whitehall[u]; every one crowded round the five members, forming conjectures and giving them advice and information. They knew more than they appeared to know: the French minister, who had for a long time held a secret correspondence with them, and the countess of Carlisle, who was said to be Pym's mistress, had given them notice of the stroke of policy preparing by Charles[x], but they did not mention it. Suddenly, in came captain Langrish, who had formerly been in the French service, and whose

[s] Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 474, 476; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 1007—1008.

[t] January 4th, 1642. [u] Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 476, 480.

[x] Ibid. p. 477; Whitelocke, p. 51; Warwick's Memoirs, p. 170, in the Collection; Hist. de la Revolution, par M. Mazure, vol. iii. p. 429, note 4, in the extracts of the correspondence of the French ministers with London; Madame de Motteville's Memoirs, vol. i. p. 266, (12th edit. 1750.)

connection with some of the cashiered officers gave him an opportunity of seeing all that was going on. He announced that the king was coming, that he had seen him set out from Whitehall followed by three or four hundred men, guards, cavaliers, and students, and that his object was to demand the persons of the accused. A great tumult arose, but the necessity of a prompt decision soon appeased it. The house counselled the five members to withdraw, as several had already laid their hands on their swords, and were preparing to resist. Pym, Hampden, Hollis, and Haslerig, immediately departed; Strode alone refused; he was advised, entreated, and pressed, all to no purpose; the king was already in the yard; at last, his friend, Sir Walter Earl, roughly pushed him out. The whole house had taken their seats. The king had traversed Westminster-hall between a double rank of his servants; but only his body-guard ascended the stairs leading to the house; when he arrived at the door, he left them outside, forbidding them under penalty of death to follow him a step further, and with his head uncovered, accompanied only by his nephew, he entered. All the members rose to receive him. The king, as he passed, cast a glance at the place where Pym usually sat; not seeing him there, he advanced towards the speaker, and said that with his permission he would take possession of his chair for a while. Having cast his eyes round on the whole assembly, he said:

"Gentlemen, I am sorry for this occasion of coming to you. Yesterday I sent a serjeant-at-arms to demand some of your number who by my command were accused of high treason. Instead of obedience, I received a message. I must here declare to you, that though no king that ever reigned in England could be more careful of your privileges than I shall be, yet in cases of treason no person has privilege. I came to see if any of the accused are here, for as long as they retain a seat in this house, I cannot hope to see you return to the right path, in which I am so anxious that you should tread. Therefore I am come to tell you that I must have these men wheresoever I can find them." He asked the speaker where they were; the speaker, falling on his knees, said, "Sir, I have neither eyes to see nor tongue to speak, in this place, but as the house is pleased to direct me, whose servant I am. And I humbly ask pardon, that I cannot give any other answer to what your majesty is pleased to demand of me." "Very well," replied the king, "since I see all the birds are flown, I do expect you will send them to me as soon as they return. But I assure you, on the word of a king, I never did intend any force, but shall proceed against them in a fair and legal way; for I never meant any other; and now, since I see I cannot have what I came for, I will not disturb you any longer; but, I repeat it, as soon as they shall return I expect that you will send them to me; if not, I shall discover the means

of finding them." He then left the chair with his hat still in his hand. The house was silent with amazement; but from several parts of the hall, as the king withdrew, many members cried aloud, 'Privilege! Privilege[y]!'

As soon as he was gone, the house, without doing or announcing any thing, adjourned to the next day; all the members went away in a hurry to learn how far the king's designs had been carried into effect, and what were the feelings of the public. They found the people assembled outside, on the stairs, in the great hall, at the gates of Westminster, as well as their own servants who were waiting for them, all disturbed, and as much agitated as themselves. Nothing was talked of but the insults of the cavaliers: one who had a pistol in his hand had been heard to say, "Only show me the mark, I trust I shall not miss my aim." "Let the commons go to the devil," said another, "what have we to do with such as they? let them be brought out and be hanged." Some had even inquired, "When will the order come?" as if they expected some sanguinary employment; and these speeches, rapidly carried from one to another, everywhere inspired the same indignation[z]. The five members had retired into the city; the citizens were

[y] Rushworth, part 3. vol. i. p. 477; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1009—1012; Journals of the House of Commons, vol. ii. p. 366, etc.; January 4th, 1642; Whitelocke, p. 50.

[z] Rushworth, part 3. vol. i. p. 484—486; Ludlow's Memoirs, in the Collection, vol. i. p. 30—32.

all in arms; the lord mayor attempted in vain to calm them; strong patrols were spontaneously formed for the general safety; and during the whole evening bands of apprentices, wandered about the streets crying out from door to door that the cavaliers were coming to set the city on fire; some even added that the king himself was at their head[a].

The agitation was as great in Whitehall. The king and queen had built the highest hopes on the effects of this blow; it had for a long time occupied all their thoughts, and had been the subject of their secret conferences with their most intimate confidants. In the morning Charles had kissed his wife before he went away, and promised her that he would return in an hour, at last the master of his kingdom; and the queen, her watch in hand, had reckoned the minutes till his return[b]. All was undone; and though the king still persisted in his design, it was without hope, and without knowing how to accomplish it. His wisest friends, Hyde, Falkland, and Colepepper, offended and sorrowful, kept aloof, and advised nothing. A proclamation was issued ordering the gates to be closed and that no citizen should give shelter to any of the accused[c]; but no one, not even at court, deceived himself as to the complete impotency of these orders. Every one very well knew what had become of the five

[a] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 332.
[b] Madame de Motteville's Memoirs, vol. i. p. 265.
[c] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 332.

members; even the house in which they were was known [d]; but no one was bold enough to imagine that they could attack them there. Lord Digby alone was desirous to expiate by his temerity the imprudence of his advice and his weakness in the house of peers at the moment of the impeachment. He proposed to the king to go personally with Lunsford and a few cavaliers to take the members from their retreat and bring them to him dead or alive. But Charles, either through some remaining respect for the laws, or through an excess of that timidity to which he was sometimes as much inclined as he was at others to be rash and daring, refused this proposal, and resolved to go himself the next day into the city, and solemnly demand of the common council that the accused should be given up to him; hoping that by his presence and gracious words he should be able to soften the people whose opposition he had not foreseen [e].

Accordingly, the next day [f] about ten o'clock, he left Whitehall without any guards and manifesting the greatest security in the affection of his subjects. The multitude crowded on his passage, but they were cold and silent, or only lifted up their voices to beg of him to live in agreement with his parliament [g]. In some places,

[d] In Coleman-street; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 338.

[e] Ibid. vol. ii. p. 332. [f] January 5th, 1642.

[g] Whitelocke, p. 51; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 334.

threatening shouts were heard, and the words 'Privilege! privilege!' echoed around him; a man by the name of Walker threw into his carriage a pamphlet, entitled "*To your tents, O Israel!*" the shout of the rebellious Israelites when they abandoned Rehoboam their king[h]. On arriving at Guildhall, he demanded in a mild and affable speech, that the five members should be given up to him, protested his devotion to the protestant religion, the sincerity of his concessions, and promised to act on every occasion according to the laws. No plaudits answered him, the common council, like the people, were grave and sorrowful. The king told one of the sheriffs, who was said to be an ardent presbyterian, that he would go and dine with him. The sheriff bowed, and when the meeting was over, he received him into his house with splendour and respect. On his return to Whitehall Charles met with the same cold reception from the crowd, and re-entered his palace full of anger and despondency[i].

The commons assembled[k]; they voted that after such an enormous breach of their privileges, they did not deem it proper to proceed to business till reparation had been made, and a guard appointed to protect them from future perils; they therefore adjourned for six days[l].

[h] Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 479.

[i] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 333, 334; Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 479, 480.

[k] January 5th, 1642. [l] January 11th, 1642.

But though they adjourned they did not remain inactive. A committee, vested with great powers [m], were ordered to meet in the city, to make full inquiry into the last attempt, and to examine, in concert with those citizens who were faithful friends to parliament, into the general state of the kingdom, particularly of Ireland. The committee was installed with great pomp at Guildhall [n]; a strong guard awaited their arrival, and a deputation from the common council received them and put all the city forces and the services of the inhabitants at their disposal [o]. Their meetings were as full of bustle as those of the house; every member who chose had a right to be present; the house, to which the five members had retired, was close by, and nothing was done without their knowledge and advice [p]. They even went several times to the committee, and the people cheered them as they passed, proud of their presence and of being able to defend them. In the midst of their victory, schemes were artfully contrived to kindle their zeal into a greater flame, and at the same time to increase their fears. The city and the commons daily contracted a closer alliance and mu-

[m] It was composed of twenty-five members; two of the king's ministers, lord Falkland and Sir John Colepepper made part of it; Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 479.

[n] January 6th.

[o] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 336—337.

[p] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 338; Whitelocke, p. 51.

tually emboldened each other[q]. At last, and, it is said, by their own authority alone, the committee, as if it had been the house itself, published a declaration containing the result of its inquiry[r]; while the common council addressed a petition to the king, complaining of his bad counsellors, of the cavaliers, of the papists, and of the new governor of the Tower; and in which also they took the part of the five members, and demanded all those reforms at which the commons had merely hinted[s].

The king was alone, shut up in Whitehall, and forsaken by the best of his counsellors. Even the cavaliers were intimidated and dispersed or kept silence. The king attempted an answer to the petition of the common council, and once more gave an order for the arrest of the accused[t]. But his answers were now without credit, and his commands without effect. He learned that in two days the house would meet again, and that the five members were to be brought back to Westminster in triumph, by the militia, the people, and even the watermen of the Thames, of whose devotion he had till then thought himself certain. "What," said he with impatience, "do these water rats also forsake me!" and this speech, soon repeated and spread among the watermen, was received as an insult

[q] Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 483.

[r] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. iii. p. 10.

[s] January 7th, 1642; Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 480.

[t] January 8th, 1642; Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 481, 482.

which they had to avenge[u]. Charles, deserted by all, humbled and irritated at the general cry which daily assailed him, without one voice on his side to oppose it, could not endure the idea of seeing the triumphant march of his enemies beneath the windows of his palace. The queen, alternately mad with anger and trembling with fear, conjured him to leave the city; besides, royalists and messengers, who had been sent to different parts of the kingdom, promised strength and safety out of London; the cavaliers, who were vanquished there, boasted of their influence in the counties; they said that away from parliament the king would be free; and without the king what could the parliament do? The resolution was taken; it was agreed first to retire to Hampton court, and to go farther afterwards if necessary; secret orders were sent to the governors of several places of whose devotion the king thought himself assured; the earl of Newcastle went to the north where his influence prevailed, and Charles, on the 10th of January, the evening before the meeting of the commons, accompanied only by his wife, his children, and a few servants, left London and the palace of Whitehall, which he was never to re-enter, save on his way to the scaffold[x].

[u] Observations on the Life and Death of king Charles, by William Lilly, in the Collection entitled 'Select Tracts relating to the civil wars of England,' etc. published by Mazères, (London, 1815,) vol. i. p. 173.

[x] Clarendon; Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. iii. p. 13; Rushworth,

The day after his departure, at about two in the afternoon, the Thames was covered with armed vessels equipped as for war, to accompany the five members back to Westminster; a numerous crowd of boats followed; on each side of the river the London militia advanced in parallel ranks, bearing the last declaration of parliament on the ends of their pikes[y]; captain Skippon, an officer who had been inured to the military service in the camp of Gustavus Adolphus, had the day before been appointed their commander. He was a rough and illiterate man, but plain, bold, of austere morals, and very popular in the city. An innumerable multitude followed this procession; as it passed Whitehall the people stopped, and with ironical shouts cried, 'What has become of the king and his cavaliers? where are they fled to[z]?' On their arrival at Westminster, the five members hastened to expatiate on the devotion of the city to the public cause, and the sheriffs were introduced into the hall to receive the thanks of the speaker. As they departed another procession approached; consisting of four thousand men, knights, gentlemen, freeholders, etc., on horseback, who had come from Buckinghamshire, Hampden's native county, with a petition to the house

part 3, vol. i. p. 564; Journals of the House of Commons, January 11th, 1642, and the following days; Whitelocke, p. 52.

[y] May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. i. p. 300, in the Collection, Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 484; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. iii. p. 15—17.

[z] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. iii. p. 17.

against popish lords, bad counsellors, and in favour of their worthy representative; they had also a petition for the upper house, and another for the king, and they wore on their hats an oath to live and die with the parliament, whoever might be its enemies [a]. On all sides that proud and joyful enthusiasm was displayed which seems to permit and command the boldest resolutions to the leaders of the people: the commons acted upon this enthusiasm, and, as a skilful pilot does of a violent but propitious wind, made the most of it. In a few hours they voted that no member could be arrested without their consent under any pretext whatsoever; a bill was agreed to which gave to both houses the right of adjourning in case of need to any place they might think fit; also an address to request of the king that it would please him to take the government of the Tower from Sir John Byron; and until an answer should be received Skippon was ordered to place guards around it, and narrowly to watch every way leading to it. Letters were despatched to Goring, governor of Portsmouth, forbidding him to receive into that town either troops or ammunition without the authority of parliament; Sir John Hotham, a rich and influential inhabitant of Yorkshire, received orders to take the command of Hull, an important place containing large arsenals. On

[a] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. iii. p. 16—20; Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 486—488.

the third day [b], the house voted that the kingdom was threatened, and should therefore without delay be put in a state of defence; the lords refused to sanction this declaration, but this the commons disregarded, having fulfilled the purpose of the declaration in giving information to the people [c].

It was with reason that the commons anticipated war; the king's only thoughts now were to prepare for it. In London he lived powerless and humiliated; but, no sooner had he left the city, than, surrounded by none but his partisans, and no longer receiving daily proofs of his own weakness, he gave himself up entirely to the hope of conquering with an armed force the enemy from whom he had retired without a struggle. The cavaliers had reassumed all their presumption; they seemed already to think that war was declared, and were in a hurry to begin it. The day after their departure, the house learned that two hundred of them, commanded by Lunsford, had proceeded to Kingston, where the storehouses of the county were, as if to take possession of them, and to establish themselves there; it was also known that lord Digby had gone there with a message from the king, thanking them for their zeal, and most assuredly to concert the plan of some fatal design. The parliament immediately took measures to counteract

[b] January 13th, 1642.

[c] Parl. Hist., vol, ii. col. 1028—1035; Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 469; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. iii. p. 20—23.

these contrivances: lord Digby was impeached, and he flew beyond sea [d]. The king thinking he was still too near London, left Hampton court for Windsor [e]; Lunsford and his cavaliers following him. Here, in a private council, it was resolved that the queen should go to Holland, and with the jewels belonging to the crown buy ammunition and arms, and solicit the help of the of the continental monarchs; the pretext to be given for this journey was the necessity of taking over the princess Mary, yet a child, to the prince of Orange to whom she had been married six months before [f]. The king, still keeping up his negotiations with the two houses, was to retire by degrees to the north, where his partisans were most numerous, and to fix his residence for a while at York till opportunity and the means of acting were in his power. Everything being thus settled, the queen with great secrecy made preparations for her journey; and the king invited the parliament to continue its examination of grievances, promising to redress them all at once, and thus to put an end to further strife [g].

The house of lords received this message with joy; the king had many friends among them; many others, frightened or tired of the contest only wished it to come to an end without trou-

[d] Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 469; Nelson, vol. ii. p. 845; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 1036; Whitelocke, p, 52.

[e] January 12th; 1642.

[f] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. .... p. ..., ...*e de la Révolutions d'Angleterre*, par le père d'Orléans, l. 9, p. 87. édit. de 1694.

[g] January 20th, 1642; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 1045, and following.

bling about the future. But the commons, more thoughtful and resolute, could not believe that the king would grant them all they desired, nor even that he would fulfil all he had promised. His proposal was in their eyes nothing but a stratagem to get rid of them, and to regain arbitrary power. They refused to accede to the thanks eagerly voted by the lords unless consent was obtained from the king to intrust the command of the Tower, of strong cities, and of the militia, to men who possessed the confidence of parliament[h]. The peers refused this amendment, but thirty-two lords protested against the refusal[i]; and the commons, strengthened by the support of this minority, presented their petition to the king. He returned a positive refusal[k] as to the government of the Tower and cities, and answered in vague and evasive terms as to the militia, evidently with the determination to grant no more concessions, and with the sole intention of gaining time. The commons did not wish to lose any: they had servants at Windsor as well as in London, for everywhere their power was acknowledged and accredited, everywhere they had spies and friends who were well informed of the king's projects, of the queen's journey, and of the intrigues of the court in the north and on the continent[l]. The peril seemed urgent: the king

[h] Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 1048.

[i] Parl. Hist. vol, ii. col. 1049.

[k] January 28th, 1642; Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 517.

[l] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. iv. p. 117.

might be ready for war before the question of the militia would be decided, and then what means would the commons have to resist? Nearer danger and more unreasonable fears disturbed the people; they talked of ammunition taken from the Tower, of plots against the lives of the party leaders, and they were irritated that their repeated victories were to no purpose. It was thought that a fresh and violent expression of public opinion would be the only expedient adapted to surmount these new obstacles, to drive the zealots to arms, persuade the passive, and strike their enemies with impotency. Petitions came from all parts; from the counties and every class of citizens; apprentices, little shopkeepers, poor workmen, the porters of London; even women crowded round Westminster to present theirs. When these last appeared, Skippon who commanded the guard was astonished: "Let us be heard," they cried, "for one woman who is here to day, there will be five hundred to morrow." Skippon went to the house of commons for orders, and, when he returned, gently persuaded them to retire. But they came again two days after, having chosen Anne Stagg, the wife of a wealthy brewer, for their speaker and bearing a petition at the end of which they explained their motives: such a step they said was not unbecoming their sex, for Christ had purchased them at as dear a rate as the men; that they suffered as much by public calamities, and had as well as they both a life to preserve and a soul to be saved;

that they did not act thus through pride or vanity of heart, nor to make themselves equal to men in authority or wisdom, but to acquit themselves as much as was in their power, of the duty they owed to God, his church, and their country. The petition was received and Pym was deputed to answer it; he told them their petition had been read and that the house returned them many thanks; he begged they would retire and let their future petitions be prayers to the Almighty for the success of their undertakings; and concluded by saying, the commons had always been, and always would be, ready as far as possible to defend them, their husbands, and children, from every evil. The women retired in silence; a remarkable example of reserve among the ravings of enthusiasm, and of moral sobriety in the midst of the violent workings of party spirit[m].

All these petitions demanded the reformation of the church, the chastisement of the papists, and the putting down of all evil-doers. In some the house of peers was openly threatened; "Let those," said they to the commons, "who among the noble lords concur with your benevolent designs, be humbly requested to unite themselves to your honourable house, to sit and vote with you as one body; thus will all our fears be dissipated, and those deeds prevented to which the

[m] Almost all these petitions were presented between Jan. 20th and Feb. 5th, 1642; that of the women among others, on Feb. 4th. Journals of the House of Commons, vol. ii. p. 404, etc.; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 1049—1055, 1072, 1076; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. iii. p. 56, 70.

most moderate would be driven by despair."— "We never suspected the commons," cried the people at the gates of Westminster, "but every thing it seems is delayed in the house of lords; let the names of those who prevent harmony between the good lords and the commons be given to us, we will see to it[n]." Even in the house of lords violence of speech began to be used between opposite parties: the earl of Northumberland said, that all who refused to agree with the commons on the subject of the militia were enemies to the commonwealth. He was requested to explain: "We all think the same," cried his friends, who till then had been in the minority upon this question. The multitude were at the door, fear began to overtake the lords; several went out, others changed their opinion. The lord chancellor Littleton himself, with some few insignificant exceptions, adopted the bill, which at last received the sanction of the house, as did a few days afterwards[o] the bill for the exclusion of the bishops, which had so long been in suspense[p].

This last bill was the one first presented to the king[q]; the ordinance for the militia being not yet ready. His perplexity was great; he had just informed the parliament of the queen's approaching journey, and to soften them as much

[n] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. iii. p. 74—75.

[o] February 5th, 1642.

[p] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. iii. p. 76, 78, 347; May, Hist. of the Long Parl. vol. i. p. 359, in the Collection; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 1099, 1367.

[q] February 7th, 1642.

as possible, he had officially given up all proceedings against the five members[r]; he had even consented to appoint Sir John Conyers, whom the commons had named[s], governor of the Tower; but his hope was to elude all further questions, and that till the day he should be able to avoid granting any thing more. The exclusion of the bishops troubled his conscience, and to give up the militia was to put all the forces of the country in the power of his adversaries. Yet he was pressed hard; his own counsellors thought he could not refuse anything; lord Falkland who still supposed him sincere, eagerly advocated concessions; Colepepper, who was not very religious, and who was fond of expedients, strongly urged the adoption of the bill for the exclusion of the bishops, contending that the one respecting the militia was far more important, that every thing might be regained by the sword, and that then it would be easy to declare void a consent exacted by violence. "Is this the advice of Hyde?" inquired the king, "No," replied Hyde, "I own that I think neither of the bills should be sanctioned." "You are right," said the king, "and thus shall I act." Colepepper went to the queen represented to her the danger to which the king, and even herself was exposed, the obstacles which would be thrown in the way of her proposed journey, the only resource by which the

[r] February 2nd, 1642; Rushworth, p. 3, vol. i. p. 492.

[s] February 11th, Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 1087; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. iii. p. 85.

king hoped to find the means of one day conquering his enemies. The queen, as easily dejected as elated, and but little inclined in favour of the Anglican bishops, was soon moved by the violence of his representations, and was easily persuaded. She went to the king, she wept, she prayed, for the sake of their own safety and that of their children. Charles could not resist her entreaties; as in Strafford's trial, with sorrow, and already repentant, he gave way, authorised the commissioners to sign the bill in his name, said no more about the militia, and immediately departed for Dover[t], where the queen was to embark.

He had scarcely arrived when a message from the commons was delivered to him; like Colepepper they cared much more for the militia bill than for the exclusion of the bishops, who were already conquered and in confinement. They had hastened to draw up their ordinance; they had mentioned in it the names of the lieutenants who were to command in each county, and they solicited its immediate sanction. The king said he should take it into consideration and give his answer when he returned[u]. While on his way back, after the queen had embarked[x], he received at Canterbury[y] another message, still more pressing than the first. At the same time he learnt that the commons refused that his son

[t] February 16th, 1642; Clarendon, Memoirs, vol. i. p. 144, 148, in the Collection.

[u] Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1083, 1085, 1091, 1097.

[x] The queen embarked on the 23rd of February.

[y] February 25th, 1642.

Charles, the prince of Wales, should accompany him to the north, whither he had intended to take him; that they had impeached the attorney-general for having obeyed his orders in accusing the five members, and that they had intercepted and opened a letter from lord Digby to the queen. So many suspicions after all he had granted offended the king as much as if his concessions had been sincere. He treated the messengers with anger, yet without giving any decisive answer[y]. On arriving at Greenwich[z], he met the prince of Wales; notwithstanding orders to the contrary given by the commons, his tutor, the marquis of Hertford, had brought him thither according to the king's desire. At length, satisfied that his wife and children were safe, he sent his answer to the parliament[a]; offering to put the militia under the command of those whom they had named, provided he retained the right to change them when he pleased, and that the principal towns in the kingdom should be excepted from the measure; that in these the militia were to remain under the government of their charters and the ancient laws. He then, without longer delay, began by slow degrees his journey to York. At Theobalds twelve commissioners from the parliament overtook him[b]; when they received his answer they

[y] Clarendon, Memoirs, vol. i. p. 153—156, in the Collection.

[z] February 26th, 1642.

[a] Dated the 28th of February; Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 521; Clarendon, Memoirs, vol. i. p. 156—160.

[b] March 1st, 1642.

immediately voted it to be a positive denial; that, if he persisted in it, they should dispose of the militia without his consent, and that his return to London could alone prevent the evils with which the kingdom was threatened. The tone of this message was rough, as if they felt their strength and were not afraid to use it. "I am so much amazed at this message," said the king, "that I know not what to answer. You speak of jealousies and fears! lay your hands on your hearts and ask yourselves whether I may not likewise be disturbed with fears and jealousies. As to the militia, I thought so much of it before I gave that answer, and am so well assured that the answer is agreeable to all that in justice or reason you can ask, or I can in honour grant, that I shall not alter it in any point. For my residence near you, I wish it might be safe and honourable, and that I had no cause to absent myself from Whitehall: ask yourselves whether I have not. God so deal with me and mine, as all my thoughts and intentions are upright for the maintenance of the true protestant profession, and for the observance and preservation of the laws; and I hope God will bless and assist those laws for my preservation[c]." He continued his journey, and a week after other commissioners overtook him at Newmarket[d]; they brought a declaration in which the parliament, recapitulating all their fears

[c] Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 523, 524; Clarendon, Memoirs, vol. i. p. 164.

[d] March 9th, 1642.

and grievances, justified their conduct, and conjured the king to return to London, and have a clear understanding with his people, and thus dissipate the dread with which all minds were filled. A deep feeling was perceivable through this firmness of language; it was equally visible in the interview between the king and the commissioners: their conversation was long, urgent, and familiar; they talked like people violently agitated by their sudden disunion, and who still endeavour to persuade each other; it was evident that although they did not hesitate and were without means of reconciliation, and knew the struggle to be inevitable, yet both parties were loath to engage in it, and, though without hope, made yet a last effort against it. "What would you have?" said the king, "Have I violated your laws? have I refused to pass any bill for the ease and security of my subjects? I do not ask what you have done for me. If there are any among you who still retain any fears I offer as free a pardon as you yourselves can desire." "But the militia, Sir?" said lord Holland. "The militia? I did not refuse it." "But if your majesty would at least return near the parliament?" "You do nothing that can induce me to return; do you think your declaration likely to persuade me? surely it was not in the rhetoric of Aristotle that you found such arts of persuasion." "The parliament," said lord Pembroke, "have already begged of your majesty to return." "Your declaration proves that your

words are not to be regarded." "Will your majesty then deign to tell us what you desire before you can take this resolution." "I would have a child in Westminster school whipped who could not discover in my answer what I mean; you are deceived if you see in it a refusal to return near the parliament." "Would it not be possible to put the militia in the power of parliament, at least, for a limited time?" "No, by God! not for an hour! you require in that what was never before required of a king, what I would not grant to my wife or my children." Then turning towards the commissioners of the commons, he said: "The business of Ireland will never be settled by the means which you have chosen; an assembly of four hundred persons will never do it; it must be intrusted to the care of one man. If I had the management of it I would pledge my life that it should be settled. I am now but a beggar, yet I could find money to execute it[e]." These last words awakened every suspicion; they were thought to contain the acknowledgment of some hidden resources, the intention of upbraiding parliament, and of imputing to them the troubles with which Ireland was distracted, and finally, the wish of

[e] This conversation is taken from a pamphlet published in London immediately after the return of the commissioners, (at W. Gay's, 1642,) which contained an account of all that passed between them and the king. The printer of this pamphlet was summoned and questioned by the peers; he said he held the MS. from the chancellor's secretary, and the house dismissed him. Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1126, 1127; Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 526—533.

being alone at the head of an army, to dispose of it according to his pleasure. Here the conference ceased; the commissioners departed, and the king continued his journey without any other incident.

Now began between the king and parliament of England a struggle unprecedented in Europe; the clear and glorious symptom of a revolution which was then beginning, and is in our own days advancing towards maturity. The negotiations continued, the parties even proposed to treat, but without either of them hoping any satisfactory result. They no longer addressed themselves to each other in their declarations and messages; both appealed to the whole nation, to public opinion; from this new power both seemed to expect their strength and their success. The origin and extent of kingly power, the privileges of both houses, the limits of the allegiance due by subjects, the militia, petitions, the distribution of offices, became the subjects of an official controversy, in which the general principles of social order, the different kinds of government, the primitive rights of liberty, the history, laws, and customs of England, were all in turns alleged, explained, and commented upon. In the debates which took place between the two parties, whether in the two houses, or on the field of battle, reason and science interposed, if I may so speak, during several months, suspending the course of events and using their utmost endeavours to win over to themselves the

voluntary adherence of the people, by stamping on one or the other of the causes the character of legitimacy. At the opening of parliament, England certainly had neither expected a revolution nor wished to attempt it; the dissenters alone meditated one in the church; the return to legal order, the re-establishment of ancient liberties, the reform of present abuses, had been alone the hope and wish of the nation. The leaders themselves, bolder and more enlightened, formed no higher projects; the energy of their will surpassed the ambition of their thoughts; and they had gone on from day to day without any distant aim, without any system, impelled by the more progressive developement of their situation, and to satisfy urgent necessity. When the moment arrived for drawing the sword all were astonished and agitated: not that their hearts were timid, nor that civil war appeared either to the parliament or the people any thing strange or criminal; they read of it with pride in the great charter and in the history of their country; there they saw that more than once the people had braved their masters, taken away and given the crown; these days had been so long passed that the misery of them was forgotten and they only looked at the glorious example of their energy and power. But it had always been in the name of the laws, of certain and acknowledged rights, that resistance had been manifested; in fighting for liberty England had always thought it was defending its inheritance; and to the words 'law,' 'legal power,' that

popular and spontaneous respect was shown; which repels discussion and sanctions the boldest designs.

At this time, both parties accused each other of illegality and innovations, and both with justice; for one had violated the ancient laws of the kingdom, and would not forsake the maxims of tyranny; and the other claimed, in the name of principles yet confused, a liberty and a power till then unknown. Both felt it necessary to cloak their deeds and pretensions with an appearance of legality; both wished to justify themselves, not only according to reason, but according to the laws. With them the whole nation rushed eagerly to the contest, still more agitated than their leaders, by feelings that seemed to contradict each other, yet all equally sincere. Scarcely freed from an oppression which the laws of their ancestors had condemned, without foreseeing that it would ever exist, they ardently sought for efficacious guarantees; but still it was to these same laws whose impotency they had lately felt, that their hope was attached. New opinions and new ideas fermented among them, in which they trusted with strong and pure faith; giving themselves up entirely and confidently to that enthusiasm which seeks the triumph of virtue at whatever price: at the same time they were modest in their thoughts, tenderly faithful to long-established customs, full of respect for their old institutions, and wished to believe, that, far from changing any thing in them, they were

only rendering them homage, and imparting to them new vigour. From this arose the singular mixture of boldness and timidity, sincerity and hypocrisy, which so peculiarly characterise all the publications, official or private, with which England was then filled. The zeal of the nation was unbounded, the emotion universal and without restraint; in London, York, and in all the great towns of the kingdom, pamphlets, periodical and irregular journals, were multiplied and circulated in every direction[f]; political, historical, and religious questions, news, sermons, plans, counsels and invective, every thing had a place in them, every thing was brought before the public and discussed. Willing messengers hawked them in remote country places; at the assizes, on market days, at the doors of churches, there were crowds to read and buy; and in the midst of this unbounded intellectual liberty, in the midst of this appeal so new to public opinion, while at bottom both of writings and proceedings already reigned the principle of national sovereignty grappling with the divine right of kings, yet the statutes, jurisprudence, traditions, and customs, were constantly invoked as the only legitimate judges of the strife; in fact, revolution was everywhere, without any one daring to say so, or even owning it to himself.

[f] The following are the titles of a few of these publications: Mercurius, Aulicus, Mercurius Britannicus, Rusticus, Pragmaticus, Politicus, Publicus, Diurnal Paper, Diurnal Occurrences, A Perfect Diurnal of some Passages in Parliament; London Intelligence etc. etc.

While minds were thus disposed, the moral position of parliament was a false one; for it was under the guidance of parliament, and to its advantage that the revolution was going on; they were forced to disown it and carry it forward at the same time; their words and their actions alternately belied each other, and they painfully hesitated between boldness and subtlety, violence and hypocrisy. Considering their maxims and measures, only as exceptions applicable to a critical period, and to be laid aside when necessity no longer called for them, their principles were just and their resolutions legitimate; but parties do not rest satisfied with the possession of mere ephemeral legitimacy; nations do not thus passionately devote themselves to the doctrines and interests of a day; even at the moment while they are governed by the present alone, they are fond of indulging in the belief of the perpetuity of their opinions and deeds, and assume to direct the future in the name of eternal truth. Not satisfied with sovereign power, the parliament voted as a law, and as if to explain the legal order of the country, that the command of the militia did not belong to the king; that he could not refuse his sanction to bills approved by the people; that the houses had the right to declare what was law; and, finally, that it was good and lawful to solicit by petitions the change of customs and statutes then in vigour, but that all petitions for their maintenance should be re-

pelled as useless and without importance[g]. Notwithstanding the uncertainty and diversity of ancient examples, maxims such as these, established as permanent and public rights, were evidently contrary to the historical foundation, the regular condition, and even the existence of monarchy. The king knew this, and made the most of it. In his answers he spoke in the name of the laws and traditions of old England. Learned and able champions took up his cause. Edward Hyde, who was still in London, sometimes alone and sometimes in concert with Falkland, composed the answers to every publication of parliament. These compositions were speedily conveyed to York by secret messengers, and delivered to the king, who passed whole nights in copying them with his own hand, that their authors might not be known, and then had them published in the name of his council[h]. Written with talent and perspicuity, sometimes in an ironical style, they were effective by placing in a strong light the subtlety and deceit of the parliament, and the illegality of its pretensions. Charles, in fact, had ceased to govern; he had no *present* tyranny to excuse; he could keep silence on his secret principles and thoughts, and on his despotic hopes, and call the law to witness against his adversaries,

[g] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. iii. p. 136, 145; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 1140, under the date of March 22nd, 1642.

[h] Clarendon's Memoirs, vol. i. p. 157, 167, 171, in the Collection; Warwick's Memoirs, p. 164, ibid.

who were now the reigning despots. So great was the effect of these royal publications, that parliament thought it necessary to counteract them by every means in their power; while the king, conscious of the superiority of his declarations, both in style and reasoning, caused the manifestoes of parliament to be printed on the same sheet, that the people might be better able to form a comparison between them[i]. The royalist party visibly increased; they soon grew bolder, and turned the arms of liberty against their adversaries; George Benyon, a rich merchant in the city, addressed a petition to both houses against their bill on the militia, and many respectable citizens signed it with him[k]. The gentlemen of Kent drew up another in favour of the prerogative of episcopacy[l]; a few members of parliament, amongst others Sir Edward Dering, who first introduced the bill against the bishops, openly encouraged these proceedings[m]. The royal pamphlets were received with avidity; they were witty and haughty, and written in an elegant and deriding tone of superiority; even among the people, abuse of the leaders of the commons found welcome and credit; they talked with derision of 'King Pym,' and of the 'sugar-loaves' which he had formerly received as presents; and of 10,000*l.* of the king's money that he had, it was said, just given as a marriage por-

[i] Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 751.

[k] Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1150.

[l] March 25th, at Maidstone assizes, ibid. col. 1147.

[m] Ibid.

tion to his daughter; of the cowardice of the earl of Warwick, 'whose heart was in his shoes,' and a thousand other vulgar sayings, which some time before none would have listened to or repeated [n]. In short, in both houses the king's friends showed themselves proud and irascible; Sir Ralph Hopton and lord Herbert, men who till then had been silent, repelled all insinuations offensive to his honour. It was clear, according to the opinion of many people, that his cause was gaining ground, and that, if necessary, they would uphold it, for they no longer hesitated to declare themselves in his favour. The parliament took alarm; the vanity of the leaders was offended; nursed in popularity, they bore insult and contempt impatiently, and could not endure that in this war of the pen the advantage should appear to belong to their enemies. They attempted by tyranny to combat this danger, as much through anger as because it was their interest; all liberty of discussion ceased; Sir Ralph Hopton was sent to the Tower [o], lord Herbert censured and threatened [p], George Benyon and Sir Edward Dering were impeached [q], and the petition of the county of Kent suppressed [r]. A report was spread that it was to be presented again; Cromwell speedily informed the commons of it, and re-

[n] Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1164, 1405.
[o] March 7th, 1642; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1118.
[p] May 20th, 1642; ibid. col. 1242.
[q] March 31st, and April 26th, 1642; ibid. col. 1149, 1188.
[r] March 25th, 1642; ibid. col. 1147.

ceived orders to prevent the danger[s]. As yet without reputation in the house, though more designing and already more deeply engaged than any other in the plots of the revolution, it was in exciting the people out of doors, and by watching and giving information respecting the royalists, that Cromwell at this time employed himself, and increased his influence.

It was no longer doubtful that war would soon break out; the parties could no longer live together nor sit within the same walls. Every day some of the members left London; some, disgusted or frightened, to retire to their estates, others, to seek elsewhere, far from a town where they felt they were already conquered, fresh arms against their enemies. Most of them went to the king, whom all his counsellors had already joined[t]. An unexpected event hastened this movement, and separated the parties for ever. On the 23rd of April, the king, at the head of three hundred horse, advanced towards Hull, and requested Sir John Hotham, the governor of the place, to deliver it into his hands. Sir John, weak, irresolute, and but little opposed to the crown, and without previous instructions whereby to rule his conduct, was driven to the greatest perplexity; he begged the king to wait until he could receive instructions from the parliament. But Charles continued to advance, and at eleven o'clock appeared under the walls. He

[s] April 28th, 1642; Parl. Hist. col. 1194.

[t] May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. i. p. 338—347, in the Collection; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. iv. p. 654, etc.

had allies in the town; the evening before, his son James, duke of York, the prince palatine, his nephew, and lord Newport, had entered the town under the pretence of passing a day there. The mayor and some of the citizens went towards the gates to open them to the king; but Hotham ordered them to retire, and, followed by his officers, mounted the ramparts. The king himself summoned him to open the gates Sir John fell upon his knees and excused himself, alleging the oath he had taken to keep the place in obedience to the commands of parliament. Violent murmurs arose among the cavaliers who surrounded the king; they threatened Sir John, called him a rebel and a traitor: "Kill him, kill him!" they cried to the officers of the garrison, "throw him over!" but it was the officers who had decided the governor's resistance. In vain did Charles himself seek to intimidate or seduce him; after a long and useless conversation, he retired to a short distance, and an hour after he sent a request to Sir John to be admitted with only twenty men. Hotham refused this also; "If he had entered with only ten men," he wrote to the parliament, "I should no longer have been master of the place." The king returned to the foot of the rampart and caused Hotham and his adherents to be proclaimed traitors; and the same day he addressed a message to parliament demanding justice for such an outrage[u].

[u] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. iii. p. 235; Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 567; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1197, in which is to

The parliament of course took the part of the governor whom they had appointed, and sent answer to the king that neither fortified places nor arsenals were personal properties, which he could claim as a citizen could his field or his house; that the care of these places was intrusted to him for the safety of the kingdom, and that the same reason authorised now the commons to take it upon themselves [x]. This answer, though frank, and warranted by circumstances, was equivalent to a declaration of war. It was considered as such by both parties. Thirty-two lords and sixty members of the commons departed for York [y]. The earls of Essex and Holland, the one lord chamberlain, and the other the first gentleman of the bedchamber, received orders from the king to join him; he wished to make sure of their persons and deprive parliament of their support. They refused to obey, and thus forfeited their offices [z]. Littleton, after long and pusillanimous hesitation, sent the great

be seen the letter written by Hotham himself, giving the parliament an account of the event.

[x] Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1188, 1193, 1204, 1209.

[y] May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. i. p. 339, in the Collection; Clarendon's Memoirs, vol. i. p. 174. On June 16th, 1642, a formal appeal to the house of commons verified the absence of sixty-five members to be without any known and legitimate excuse; it was proposed that they should not re-enter the house till they had justified the motives of their absence; and this motion passed by a majority of fifty-five voices; some proposed that they should each be fined twenty-five pounds; but this proposition was negatived by a majority of twenty-five voices; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1373.

[z] Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1171—1173; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. iii. p. 182, etc.

seal to the king, and ran away himself the next day. This caused a great sensation in London, as legal government seemed to be considered to reside with the possession of the great seal. The peers were troubled and on the point of giving way. But the energy of the commons prevented all indecision. The absent members were summoned to return[a]; nine lords were impeached, on their positive refusal[b]; every one was forbidden to take up arms without the authority of parliament[c]; instructions were sent into every county to prescribe the organisation of the militia[d]; and in many places they met to exercise of their own accord. The arsenals of Hull were ordered to be transported to London, and this, notwithstanding many obstacles, was accomplished[e]. The king had ordered that the Westminster assizes should be held at York, in order that he might assemble round him the whole of the legal profession; but the parliament opposed it, and they were obeyed[f]. Finally, they appointed a committee to negotiate for a loan in the city, without giving any account of the use to which it was to be appropriated[g]; and commissioners were sent to York, composed of rich and influen-

[a] May 25th and June 2nd, 1642; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1296, 1327.

[b] June 15th, 1642; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1368.

[c] May 17th, 1642; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 1235.

[d] June 4th, 1642; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1328.

[e] Ibid. col. 1319.

[f] Ibid. col. 1233.

[g] May 31st, 1642; ibid. col. 1323.

tial gentlemen of that county, with orders to reside near the king, notwithstanding all he might say against it, and to inform both houses of whatever should fall under their cognisance[h].

The firmness of the commissioners was equal to the perils of their mission: "Gentlemen," said the king when they arrived, "for what are you come hither? I command you to depart; beware of disobedience if you remain; I say, beware! let there be no plots, no intrigues, or our accounts shall soon be drawn up[i]." They answered respectfully, but remained; they were daily insulted, often threatened, and seldom at liberty to go out, yet they secretly observed every thing, and informed the parliament of all they could learn. Great activity was displayed at York as well as in London; the king began to levy a guard; but not daring imperiously to command this service, he had called together the gentlemen of the neighbourhood, that he might obtain it from their zeal[k]. The meeting was very numerous and noisy[l]; loud acclamations greeted every word the king spoke; the commissioners of parliament were hooted. But the same day several

[h] May 2nd, 1642; these commissioners were the lords Howard and Fairfax, Sir Hugh Cholmondley, Sir Henry Cholmondley, and Sir Philip Stapleton; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1206, 1210, 1212.

[i] May 9th, 1642; from a letter of the committee to parliament, in the Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1222; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. iii. p. 249—256.

[k] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. iii. p. 281, etc.

[l] May 15th, 1642; May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. i. p. 332, in the Collection.

thousand farmers and freeholders, who had not been called upon, arrived at York; they had, they said, the same right as the gentlemen to deliberate on the affairs of the county; and they presented themselves at the doors of the hall in which the royalists had assembled. Entrance was denied them; they therefore assembled elsewhere, and protested against the measures that were reported to them. Even the nobility were divided; to the request for a guard more than fifty gentlemen gave a refusal signed with their names; at the head of the list was that of Sir Thomas Fairfax[m], who was then young and unknown, but already one of the most courageous and sincere patriots in the country[n]. Charles was intimidated, and he announced another meeting in which all the freeholders should be present: the commissioners from parliament were forbidden to appear, but the meeting was held in the plain called Heyworth moor[o], near their residence, and their advice was solicited every moment. More than forty thousand men were present; gentlemen, farmers, freeholders, and citizens; some standing, some on horseback, others in groups, or running to and fro to find their friends and collect them together. The cavaliers soon discovered that a petition was handed about amongst them, for the purpose of beseeching the king to banish

[m] Born in January, 1611, at Denton in Yorkshire.

[n] From a letter of the York committee, dated May 13th; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1226, 1233.

[o] June 3rd, 1642.

all thoughts of war, and entreating him to reconcile himself with the parliament. They gave expression to their anger by abuses and threats, falling with violence on the groups, tearing the copies of the petition from the hands of those who were reading it, and declaring that the king would not receive it[p]. Charles arrived on the plain, displeased and perplexed, not knowing what to say to the multitude whose presence and turbulence already gave him offence. After a somewhat equivocal declaration had been read, he hastily retired to avoid any petition from being presented; but Fairfax succeeded in getting near him, and, falling suddenly on one knee, put the petition on the pommel of the king's saddle, thus braving his displeasure even at his feet. The king urged his horse forward, and rudely pushed up against him, to force him to retire, but in vain[q].

So much boldness in the king's presence, in the very county in which he had most friends, frightened the royalists, particularly those who were just arrived from London, with the zeal and power of parliament strongly impressed on their minds. They thought it was a great deal to have given the king so perilous a token of their zeal as to come and join him; they did not wish to

[p] In the sixth letter of the York committee to the parliament, dated June 4th, 1642; and in a letter of Sir John Bourchier to his cousin Sir Thomas Barrington, member of the house of commons of the same date; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1345, 1353.

[q] Carte's Life of Ormond, vol. i. p. 357.

compromise themselves further, and, once at York, showed themselves cold and fearful[r]. Charles requested them to publish a declaration of the motives which had induced them to leave London; he wanted this declaration as a proof that after so many riots and so much violence the parliament was no longer a free or legal one. They signed it; but the next day several of them informed the king that if he published it they should be obliged to deny it. "What would you have me do with it?" Charles angrily demanded; but they persisted, and the declaration was not published[s]. Notwithstanding the influence and boastings of the cavaliers, nothing advanced; neither money, arms, ammunition, nor even provisions were to be procured at York; the king himself, it is said, scarcely had enough to furnish his own table, and to suffice for the ordinary expenses of his house[t]. The queen had disposed of the crown jewels in Holland, but so great was the effect of the threats of parliament, that a long time elapsed before she could send the amount to the king[u]. He forbade all his subjects to obey the orders of parliament respecting the militia[x], and gave himself commissions to the chief royalists in every county to put them into training in his name[y]; immediately

[r] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. iv. p. 139.
[s] Ibid. p. 140, 141.
[t] Ibid. p. 172, 228.
[u] Ibid. p. 118.
[x] May 27th, 1642; Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 550.
[y] The first commission of this kind was given to lord Hastings,

after, to counteract any bad effects of this measure, he protested that he had no intentions of making war; and the lords who were present declared by an official act, which was carefully circulated, that, to their knowledge, no preparations nor proceedings had in the least announced any such intention[z]. So much indecision and deceit did not arise from weakness alone; from the time the seceders from parliament had arrived Charles had been tormented with the most conflicting counsels: lawyers, magistrates, and moderate men, fully convinced that his greatest strength lay in the respect of the people for legal order, strongly advised him for the future strictly to adhere to the laws, and that he should throw upon parliament alone the blame of violating them: the cavaliers, on the contrary, cried out that delay would ruin every thing, that on all occasions it was best to anticipate the intentions of a declared enemy; and Charles, unable to give up the support of either opinion, sought to fall in with both by turns.

The situation of parliament had in the mean time become more simple; the departure of so many members had left the leaders of the revolution in undisturbed possession of power; a few members still opposed them, but they were re-

for the county of Leicester, June 11th, 1642; Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 655, etc.

[z] This declaration, dated June 15th, 1642, was signed by forty-five lords or members of the council; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1373, 1375; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. iv. p. 142, 144.

duced to the painful task of deploring and advising; and scarcely any one took the trouble of making them a reply. It was the opinion of a decided majority that war was inevitable, and they boldly determined to prosecute it, though with very different views and feelings. To keep up appearances, a committee was appointed to consider the best means of preventing it[a]; proposals for a reconciliation, consisting of nineteen articles, were even drawn up, and formally sent to the king[b]. Yet before any answer was received, care was taken to suppress all petitions favourable to peace[c], and military preparations were openly and vigorously carried on. Charles had offered to go in person to suppress the Irish rebellion, which every day increased in violence, but his offer was rejected[d]. He refused to appoint lord Warwick, whom the commons recommended, as commander of the fleet[e]; but Warwick took command of it, notwithstanding his refusal[f]. Gourney the lord mayor had the boldness to publish in London the king's commission, ordering the raising of the militia, for his service and in his name; he was impeached, sent to the

[a] May 27th, 1642; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1319.

[b] June 2nd, 1642; ibid. col. 1324, 1327; May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. i. p. 363—371, in the Collection.

[c] Among others, a petition prepared at the beginning of June, in the county of Somerset; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1366.

[d] April 15th, 1642: Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1169—1172, etc.

[e] March 31st, 1642.

[f] Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1164, 1165; May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. i. p. 395, etc., in the Collection.

Tower, deprived of his office, and alderman Pennington, a zealous puritan, appointed mayor in his stead[g]. The city lent 100,000*l.*[h]; 100,000*l.* more were taken from the funds raised for the war in Ireland[i]; a subscription was opened in both houses[k]; each member was called on in his turn and requested to state his intention immediately. Some refused: "If it should become necessary," said Sir Henry Killigrew, "I shall procure for myself a good horse, a good buff coat, and a good pair of pistols, and I shall not be at a loss to find a good cause;" but he was obliged immediately to retire to his country seat, for after such a speech he could not have passed through the streets of London without peril and insult[l]. The zeal of the people was raised to the highest pitch; in the city as well as at Westminster the withdrawal of the royalist members had lessened the number of the king's partisans. The parliament made an appeal to the patriotism of the citizens; money, plate, jewels, every thing was put in requisition to equip a few squadron of horse, under the promise of an interest of eight per cent. The pulpits resounded with the exhortations of the preachers; the effect surpassed

[g] August 18th, 1642; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1203, 1403; State Trials, vol. iv. col. 159.

[h] June 4th, 1642; Parl. Hist. vol. ii. col. 1328.

[i] July 30th, 1642; May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. ii. p. 33—40, in the Collection; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1443—1448.

[k] June 10th, 1642.

[l] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. iv. p. 136; vol. viii. p. 290.

the most sanguine expectations: in ten days such an immense quantity of plate was brought to Guildhall, that there were neither men enough to take charge of it, nor room enough to hold it: poor women brought their wedding rings, the gold or silver pins with which they fastened their hair, and several were obliged to wait a long time before their offerings could be taken out of their hands [m]. Charles, informed of the success of the commons, thought he would attempt the same means; but the enthusiasm of the people was but coldly imitated. The university of Oxford sent its plate to the king; Cambridge too, following its example, had its plate packed up; part of it indeed was already gone, when Cromwell, ever vigilant, arrived suddenly, and prevented the remainder from being sent away [n]. The king's commissioners with the greatest difficulty obtained a few trifling contributions; and mockery and jest, the vain and dangerous gratification of a conquered court, were the only consolations left to the cavaliers [o].

When the proposals for accommodation reached York [p], they surpassed what the most violent

[m] May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. i. p. 376, in the Collection.; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. iv. p. 136; Whitelocke, p. 58.

[n] May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. ii. p. 196, in the Collection; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1453; Querela Cantabrigiensis, p. 182, (8vo. London, 1685); Barwick's Life, p. 24, (8vo. London, 1724); Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. v. p. 53.

[o] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. v. p. 54—57; May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. i. p. 401.

[p] They were presented to the king on the 17th of June.

royalists had predicted, and rendered the most moderate hopeless. The parliament demanded the complete destruction of royal prerogative, and that all authority should be lodged in their hands. The creation of new peers, the appointment or dismissal of all the great officers of state, the education and marriage of the king's children, in a word, military, civil, and religious affairs, were all to be under the control of parliament. Such indeed was, at the bottom, the true aim, and was one day to be the inevitable result of this revolution; but the time was not yet come in which this substitution of parliamentary for royal power could be established by the natural working of existing institutions and forms; the predominant, though indirect influence of the commons on the daily exercise of power was as yet unknown. The national party, being as yet unacquainted with that form of policy, by which the parliament now forces upon the crown its own leaders as ministers, saw no means of safety to themselves or to their cause but in officially subjecting the crown to the direct dominion of parliament; a fallacious and impracticable method, leading directly to anarchy; still it was the only one at this time that the most enlightened politicians could suggest. When the king read these proposals, his eye flashed with anger, and his countenance became suffused with a deep crimson; "Should I grant these demands," he said, "I may be waited on bare-headed; I may have my hand kissed, the title of 'majesty' may be

continued to me; and 'the king's authority, signified by both houses,' may still be the style of your commands; I may have swords and maces carried before me, and please myself with the sight of a crown and sceptre (though even these twigs would not long flourish, when the stock upon which they grew was dead): but as regards any true and real power, I should no longer be more than the image, but the mere shadow of a king[q]:" he broke off all further negotiation.

The parliament expected no other answer: as soon as they received it, all hesitation disappeared, even in outward forms, and civil war was deliberated upon[r]. One member only, the same who in the beginning of the session had been one of the first to expose public grievances, rose to oppose it; this was Sir Benjamin Rudyard. He said: "I am well aware of what is important to the honour of the house and the success of this parliament; but to judge correctly of our present situation, we should look to what it was three years ago. Had any one then told us that in three years the queen, from any motive, would leave England, and seek refuge in the Netherlands; that the king would quit London for York, because he did not feel safe in London; that a general rebellion would have spread over Ireland; that the church and state would be agitated by the discord which now divides them, truly we should have shuddered at the mere idea

[q] Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 788.

[r] July 9th, 1642.

of such a state of things: let us appreciate it in the same manner now that we are fallen into it. On the other hand, if any one had told us that in three years we should have a parliament, that ship-money would be done away with, that monopolies, the high commission court, the star-chamber, the votes of bishops, would be abolished, that the jurisdiction of the privy council would be regulated and restrained, that we should have triennial parliaments, nay, more, a perpetual parliament, which no one but ourselves could have the right to dissolve, truly we should have thought all this too much to be real. Well, all this is really come to pass, and yet we do not enjoy it; we still cry out for more guarantees. The actual possession of all these privileges is the best guarantee we can have; for they protect each other. Let us take care lest in seeking an imagined security through so many dangers, we put in peril that which we possess already. Should we obtain every thing we wish, even then we could not enjoy an infallible security; all human guarantees may become corrupt, and fail. God's providence will not be restricted; success must remain in his hands. . . . . It is now that we are called upon to exercise all the wisdom of which we are capable, for we are on the eve of fire and chaos. If once blood touches blood, we fall into a certain evil, to obtain an uncertain success, God knows when, and what! Every one has a right to make a last effort to prevent the effusion of blood; for the shedding of blood is a

sin which calls aloud for vengeance; it stains a whole country. Let us save our liberties and property, but in such a way that we may also save our souls. I have clearly acquitted my own conscience, I now leave every one to his[s]." This was the fruitless appeal of one man, who could do nothing now but retire from a struggle too violent and agitated for his chaste and prudent virtue. Other thoughts and fears, as legitimate, though allied to blind and headlong passions, imperiously prevailed among the national party; and the day was come, in which good and evil, peril and safety, were so confusedly intermixed, that the firmest minds were incapable of discerning them, and were but the instruments of Providence, who alternately chastises kings by their people, and people by their kings. Only forty-five members in the commons partook of Rudyard's scruples[t], and in the house of peers the earl of Portland alone protested[u]. Measures for carrying on the war were immediately adopted; the houses seized for their own expenditure all the public revenues[x]; the counties were ordered to prepare arms and powder, and to be ready at the earliest notice. Five peers and ten members of the house of commons, under the name of the committee of safety, were charged with the care

[s] Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1416—1418.

[t] The levying of ten thousand volunteers in London was voted in the commons by one hundred and twenty-five voices against forty-five; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1409.

[u] Ibid. col. 1414. [x] Ibid. col. 1349.

of the public defence, and to see the orders of parliament executed [y]. At last, the formation of an army was voted, composed of twenty regiments of foot, of about a thousand men each, and seventy-five squadrons each of sixty horse. Lord Kimbolton, lord Brook, Sir John Merrick, Hampden, Hollis, Cromwell, all leaders of the people in the camp as well as at Westminster, held commands in this army. The earl of Essex was appointed general [z].

[y] July 4th, 1642; the five lords were the earls of Northumberland, Essex, Pembroke, Holland, and viscount Say; the ten members of the commons, Hampden, Pym, Hollis, Martyn, Fiennes, Pierpoint, Glyn, Sir William Waller, Sir Philip Stapleton, and Sir John Merrick.

[z] The reader will perhaps peruse with interest a list of the commanders of this truly national army; it is therefore given at the end of this volume.

HISTORY OF

THE ENGLISH REVOLUTION,

FROM THE ACCESSION OF CHARLES I.

BOOK THE FOURTH.

1642—1643.

When the king heard of these dispositions he felt freed from all uncertainty, and displayed a greater degree of vigour. A small quantity of ammunition had been sent from Holland by the queen, and she had promised to send more[a]. The marquis of Hertford, the earl of Northampton, lord Strange, Sir Ralph Hopton, Sir Henry Hastings, the commissioners whom the king had charged to raise troops in his name, met with some success in the northern and western counties[b]. Goring the governor of Portsmouth declared in his favour[c]. The cavaliers rose on all sides; they spread over the villages, entered by force into the houses of the friends of the parliament, and took possession of their arms,

[a] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell., vol. iv. p. 173.

[b] May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. ii. p. 16—23.

[c] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell., vol. iv. p. 243, etc.; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1440.

money, and horses, and arrived at York proud of their victory and their booty. Charles felt that this behaviour would be injurious to his cause, and in order to repress it, as well as to excite the zeal of the royalists in his favour, he went himself through the counties of York, Leicester, Derby, Nottingham, and Lincoln, everywhere calling the nobility together, thanking them for their faithful adherence, and exhorting them to be orderly and prudent; he was more active and affable than he usually appeared, taking care to speak with even the common people, and everywhere proclaiming his attachment to the religion and laws of the country [d].

These gatherings, these speeches, the nobles forsaking or fortifying their houses, the citizens rebuilding the walls of their towns, the roads covered with armed travellers, the daily exercise of the militia, all combined to give the country the appearance of being in open war; and in all parts of the kingdom there seemed a wish and desire to commence it. Blood had already been spilt in several rencounters, more like sudden broils than battles [e]. The king, by two fruitless attempts at Hull and Coventry, had given the parliament the power of regarding him as the aggressor [f]. Both parties desired to avoid this

[d] May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. ii. p. 40, 41, 55, in the Collection; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell., vol. iv. p. 216, etc.

[e] May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. ii. p. 16; Whitelocke, p. 59.

[f] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell., vol. iv. p. 257; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1456.

reproach; they were ready to risk every thing to maintain their rights, but both trembled at the idea of having to answer for what might take place. On the 23rd of November, Charles at last resolved officially to call his subjects to arms, by erecting the royal standard at Nottingham. At six in the evening, on the summit of the hill, which overlooks the town, escorted by eight hundred horse and a small body of militia, he first caused his proclamation to be read. The serjeant-at-arms had already begun, when, a doubt rising in the king's mind, he took the paper from his hand, and slowly corrected several passages on his knee, then returned it to the serjeant, who could scarcely read the corrections. The trumpets sounded and the standard was brought forward bearing these words as a motto: "Render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's;" but no one knew where to erect it, nor the proper forms of this ancient custom by which the lord paramount formerly assembled his vassals. The sky was clouded and the wind blew with violence. The standard was first erected in the interior of the castle, on the top of a tower, as had been done by Richard the Third, the last king that could be remembered to have resorted to this custom. The next day the wind blew it down. "Why did you put it there?" said the king; "it should have been set up in an open place, where every one might have approached it, not in a prison:" he then ordered it to be removed from the castle and erected near the

park. When the serjeants-at-arms were about to drive it into the ground, they found that the soil was hard and rocky. They, however, dug a little hole with their swords, in which they attempted to fix it, but in vain, and for several hours they were obliged to hold it up. The spectators withdrew, their minds disturbed by evil forebodings[g]. The king passed a few days at Nottingham, in fruitless expectation that the country would answer his appeal. The parliamentary army was forming at the same time at Northampton, not far from the king, and already amounted to several regiments. "If they chose to attempt it," said Sir Jacob Astley, who was major-general of the royal army, "I really would not answer whether they might not take the king in his bed[h]." Some members of the council recommended that a negotiation should be proposed. "What, already!" said the king, "before the war is begun!" Still they insisted, urging his weakness. Four messengers[i] were sent to London[k], but returned unsuccessful; one of them, lord Southampton, had not even been allowed to deliver his message personally to the house[l].

[g] Rushworth, part 3, vol. i. p. 783; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell., vol. iv. p. 258; William Lilly, Observations on the Life and Death of King Charles, in Select Tracts, by M. Mazeres, vol. i. p. 176.

[h] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell., vol. v. p. 2.

[i] The earls of Southampton and Dorset, Sir John Colepepper, and Sir William Uvedale.

[k] August 25th, 1642.

[l] Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1458—1460.

The king left Nottingham[m], and notwithstanding his disinclination to remove farther from London, he established his quarters at Shrewsbury, upon hearing that the western counties showed more favour to his cause.

The earl of Essex had been at the head of the parliamentary army for more than a week; when he left London[n] an immense crowd accompanied him with loud acclamations, waving orange-coloured streamers (the colour of his house) in the air. All who wore other colours were suspected and insulted[o]. At Northampton he found twenty thousand men already assembled. A committee from both houses attended him to assist and advise with him; but under his authority, and without any power to control him[p]. His instructions were, to present a petition to the king requesting his return to London; and, if he refused, to follow him everywhere, and by battle, or by other means, to take his majesty, together with his two sons, the prince of Wales and the duke of York, from their perfidious counsellors, and bring them back to the parliament[q].

The petition was not even presented; the king declaring he would not receive one from

[m] Towards the middle of September.

[n] September 9th, 1642.

[o] May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. ii. p. 57; Whitelocke, p. 59.

[p] Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1473; the committee was composed of twelve lords and twenty-four members of the commons.

[q] Ibid. col. 1471.

men whom he had proclaimed as traitors[r]. At Shrewsbury he had gained strength and confidence; from the west and the north a great number of recruits had at length arrived; to equip them the king had taken, not without resistance, the arms of the militia of several counties; and supplies destined for Ireland, which were on the way to embark at Chester, had also been seized. The papists of Shropshire and Staffordshire had advanced him the sum of 5,000*l.*; a gentleman paid 6,000*l.* to obtain the distinction of knighthood; and even from London the king's party had secretly sent him money. About 12,000 men had enlisted under his banners[s]. Prince Rupert, his nephew[t], who had lately arrived from Germany[u], at the head of the cavalry overrun the neighbouring country, where he had already made himself odious by pillages and brutal treatment of the inhabitants, whom he had already inspired with awe by his severity. Essex advanced but slowly, as if he meant to follow rather than to overtake his enemy. On the 23rd of September he arrived at Worcester, where he spent three weeks inactively. Charles, emboldened by this, by the success of a few skirmishes, and the improved

[r] October 16th, 1642; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1484.

[s] May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. ii. p. 37—39, 56, 66—69; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell., vol. v. p. 24, 29, 41, 60, 62, 68; Mrs. Hutchinson's Memoirs, vol. i. p. 199—212, in the Collection.

[t] The second son of Frederick the Fifth, king of Bohemia, and of Elizabeth, sister to Charles the First.

[u] At the beginning of September.

state of his affairs, resolved to march upon London, and finish the war by one blow; and he had already been three days on his way thither to follow up this intention, before Essex turned back to defend the parliament.

At this news the greatest agitation prevailed in London; so sudden a peril had not been expected; the parliamentary party were astonished, the royalists began to put themselves in motion, the people were alarmed. But the fear of the people is easily turned into anger, and the parliament well knew how to excite it. As firm and impassioned in action as they had been in speech they immediately took measures for defence against the king, and others full of rigour against the disaffected. All who had not subscribed to the voluntary contributions, were taxed and forced to do so; those who refused were sent to prison; all the suspected were disarmed: requisitions of all kinds took place; all the stables in the town and suburbs were visited, and all horses fit for service seized. Fortifications were hastily raised, a crowd of men, women, and children assisting; chains were hung across and barricades made in the streets; the militia were kept continually on foot, and ready to march at a moment's notice[x].

Suddenly, on the morning of the 24th of October, a report arrived that a great battle had

[x] May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. ii. p. 70; Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1478, 1485; Whitelocke, p. 60; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell., vol. v. p. 51.

been fought, that the parliamentary army was completely routed, and many officers killed and made prisoners: the news, it was said, had been brought by Sir James Ramsay, a Scotchman, and colonel of a regiment of horse, as he rapidly passed through Uxbridge in his flight. Nearly at the same time a contradictory, though quite as uncertain a report arrived, that Essex had routed the king's army and gained a complete victory. This news also was said to come from people who had been met on the Uxbridge road, galloping with all possible speed to announce this wonderful success[y].

The parliament, as ignorant as the people, commanded the tradesmen to close their shops, the militia to keep their posts, and the citizens to wait for orders; requiring, at the same time, from every member a personal declaration of a firm adherence to the earl of Essex and his cause whatever had happened or might happen[z]. It was not till the next day[a] that lord Wharton and Mr. Strode brought an official account of the battle and its results.

This had been fought on the 23rd of October near Keynton in Warwickshire, at the foot of an eminence called Edgehill: not till he had reached this place, after a march of ten days, during which both armies had been completely

[y] Whitelocke, p. 61; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell., vol. v. p. 101—103.

[z] Parl. Hist., vol. ii. col. 1494.

[a] October 26th, 1642.

ignorant of each other's designs, had Essex, at last, overtaken the king's troops. Though he had left part of his artillery and several regiments, amongst others that of Hampden, behind, he resolved immediately upon attacking the enemy, while the king, it appears, had just come to the same resolution. Both commanders were eager for a battle; Essex to save London, the king to put an end to the obstacles he met with in a county so adverse to his cause, that even the blacksmiths left their homes that they might not be compelled to shoe the horses of his army[b]. The conflict was warm; it began about two in the afternoon, and did not cease till the evening: Essex's cavalry, weakened at the commencement by the desertion of Sir Faithful Fortescue's whole regiment, which went over to the enemy at the commencement of the attack, were put to flight by prince Rupert; but in his wild and imprudent ardour, excited also by the hope of pillage, he pursued the fugitives more than two miles, without thinking of what was going on behind him. Stopped, at last, by Hampden's corps, which was advancing with the artillery, the prince returned towards the field of battle; and there found the royal infantry dispersed, the earl of Lindsey, commander in chief, mortally wounded and taken prisoner, and the king's standard fallen into the hands of the parliamentarians; the king himself had, at one time, been

[b] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell., vol. v. p. 78.

in great danger of being made prisoner. Essex's army of reserve remained alone on the field in good order. Charles and his nephew vainly endeavoured to rally their troops; they had returned all in confusion, the soldiers seeking their officers and the officers their soldiers; the horses falling with fatigue, and no hopes remained of renewing the contest. Both armies passed the night on the field of battle, anxious for the morrow, though both claimed the victory. Essex suffered most in the loss of men, and the king in the loss of distinguished persons and officers. When the day broke, Charles examined his camp; a third of the infantry and many cavaliers were missing; not that all these had perished, but the cold, the want of provisions, and the violence of the conflict, had sickened a great number of the volunteers, and they had dispersed[c]. The king would willingly have hazarded another battle in order to continue his march upon London without obstruction, but he soon perceived it to be impracticable. In the parliamentary camp also the same question was debated; Hampden, Hollis, Stapleton, most of the officers of the militia and members of the commons conjured Essex immediately to renew the attack: the king, they said, was unable to withstand them; they had been joined by three fresh regiments; he must therefore fall into their

[c] Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 33, 38; May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. ii. p. 73, 82; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell., vol. v. p. 76—87.

hands or be forced to accept their conditions; while the speedy conclusion of the war could alone save both the country and the parliament from evils which no one could foresee. But colonel Dalbier and others, soldiers by profession, officers inured to war on the continent, strongly opposed these arguments: they insisted that to have fought so glorious a battle with an army of recruits was in itself a great achievement; London was saved; but its safety had been dearly bought; the soldiers, who were all novices, were astonished and dispirited; they would not face the enemy again so soon with a good heart: the parliament had but one army, it should be trained to war, and not risked all at once. They spoke with authority; Essex adopted their advice [d], and removed his head quarters to Warwick, to the rear of the royal army, but posted in such a manner as to observe all its movements. A few days afterwards, the king, advancing towards London, though without any design of reaching it, established his head quarters at Oxford, which of the large towns of the kingdom was the most devoted to his cause.

Thanksgivings were offered up both in London and Oxford; for the friends of parliament said one among another, that they had gained a great deliverance, though but a small victory. They soon discovered that their deliverance was not so complete as they had imagined [e]. The king's

[d] Whitelocke, p. 61. [e] Ibid.

army so much nearer to them than that of Essex, spread over the country; most of the deserters had returned to their regiments, the hope of booty soon overcoming their first panic. Banbury, Abingdon, Henley, places which had been thought secure for the parliament, opened their gates to the king, without the slightest resistance; the garrison of Reading, commanded by Henry Martyn, a friend of Cromwell, and a cynical demagogue, took flight at the first approach of a few squadrons[f]; and the king transferred his head quarters to that town. Prince Rupert made excursions and pillaged the villages even in the very neighbourhood of London[g]. The city began to take alarm; the peers were ready to welcome any pacific proposals[h]. Essex received orders to draw nearer with his troops; and, in the mean time, the parliament resolved to request a safeguard from the king, for six deputies, appointed to open a negotiation. The king refused to receive Sir John Evelyn, whom he had the day before[i] proclaimed a traitor[k]. The commons wanted to break off the negotiation, as Essex had arrived, and they felt safe[l]. The lord mayor called the citizens together[m]. Two members of parliament, lord Brook and Sir

[f] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion. vol. v. p. 121.
[g] Whitelocke, p. 61.
[h] October 29th, 1642; Parl. Hist. vol. iii. col. 1.
[i] November 2nd, 1642.
[k] Parl. Hist. vol. iii. col. 2—5; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. v. p. 122.
[l] November 7th, 1642.
[m] November 8th, 1642.

Harry Vane, attempted to excite their courage, and exhorted them immediately to rank themselves under the general's standard: "For he has obtained," said lord Brook, "the greatest victory that was ever heard of; he has killed two thousand of the enemy, while we have not lost a hundred; no not a hundred, unless you choose to reckon the women, children, carters, and dogs, for the king's people killed dogs and all; then, perhaps, you could make up *two* hundred. Well, gentlemen, the general wishes to resume his march to-morrow, he wishes to do more than he has done already; and it is for you that he is anxious; for, as regards himself, nothing disturbs him; he can be a freeman, a gentleman, or a lord; he can go wherever he pleases; it is for you alone, that he will march to-morrow. When you hear the drum beat, for positively the drum will beat to-morrow, do not, I beg of you, say: I do not belong to the militia, and this that and the other, but rather march and fight valiantly, and it shall be the day of your deliverance[n]." The chamber rang with acclamations; yet terror was not dispelled. The king, whose partisans informed him of every thing which passed, had hastened his march; he had reached Colnbrook, only fifteen miles from London. The parliament took the resolution of sending five of their deputies, without insisting on the admission of Evelyn. Charles received

[n] Parl. Hist. vol. iii. col. 6-9.

them well[o], and said, that in all places, even at the gates of the city, he would consent to treat[p]. When the king's answer was read in the upper house[q], Essex rose and inquired what he was to do; whether he was to continue, or suspend hostilities. He was ordered to suspend them for the present; and sir Peter Killigrew departed to treat for an armistice. When he arrived at Brentford, seven miles from London, he found that hostilities had been renewed. Notwithstanding the negotiation, the king had continued to advance, and had fallen unawares on Hollis's division, which was quartered at Brentford, in the hope of easily crushing it, and entering suddenly into the city. But the valour of this small corps, gave time for the arrival of the regiments of Hampden and lord Brook, who were quartered at a little distance from that place, and together they bore for several hours the brunt of the royal attack. The report of the cannon was heard in London, where all were at a loss to account for it. Essex, who was sitting in the house of lords, mounted his horse the moment he heard of it, and set off with what forces he could muster, to support the division attacked; but the battle was over before he arrived. Hampden and Hollis's soldiers, after a violent conflict, had been driven back in great disorder; the king occupied Brentford, but had

[o] November 11th, 1642.

[p] Rushworth, part. 3, vol. ii. p. 58; Parl. Hist. vol. iii. col. 9, 11.

[q] November 12th, 1642.

stopped there, and did not seem to intend advancing any farther [r].

The city was dreadfully agitated, upon hearing this news; and its agitation was much increased by its fears. Nothing was talked of but the king's perfidy and cruelty; for, it was said, that he meant to take the city by storm during the night, and give up its inhabitants, their families, and possessions, into the hands of the rapacious and licentious cavaliers [s]. The warmest advocates for war complained that he should bring it thus even under their very walls, and place in such jeopardy the lives of so many thousands of his subjects. The parliament made the most of this disposition. The apprentices were invited to enlist, with the promise, that the time they served as soldiers should be reckoned as part of their apprenticeships [t]; the city offered a body of four thousand men, taken from militia, and appointed Skippon to command them. "Now then, my fellows, my brave comrades," he said, as he put himself at their head, let us pray with a good heart, and fight with a good heart; I shall be exposed to the same dangers as you all. Remember that

[r] May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. ii. p. 102, note 1, in the Collection. In finding out exactly, and carefully comparing dates, I think I have taken all obscurity from this affair at Brentford, in the note to which I refer, which, between the parliamentarian and royalist writers, was the subject of so great a debate, and which Mr. Lingard seems to me to have totally misunderstood, Hist. of Eng. vol. x. p. 201-202.

[s] Whitelocke, p. 62.

[t] Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 53.

this is the cause of God, that you are going to defend your wives, your children, and yourselves. Come, my good and brave fellows, pray with a good heart, and fight with the same, and God will bless you[u]." During one whole day and night, these new levies of militia and volunteers were successively leaving London to join the army; and two days after the battle of Brentford[x], Essex, accompanied by most of the members of both houses, and a crowd of spectators, reviewed twenty-four thousand men, all posted in battle array on Turnham green, within a mile of the vanguard of the king's army.

The debate, which had commenced in the general's council, immediately after the battle of Edgehill, was now renewed. Hampden and his friends eagerly demanded that the attack should be made directly. Never again, they said, would the people be found so firmly convinced of their danger, and they must conquer, or lose all. For a moment, this advice prevailed, and some movements of the troops were even ordered in consequence. But Essex, and the more experienced officers, complied with unwilling hearts,—an incident happened, which helped to beat out their objections. On a certain day, the army was drawn up in battle array opposite to that of the king, when (whether it was that the royal troops appeared to make a

[u] Whitelocke, p. 62;—Parl. Hist. vol. iii. col. 14.

[x] November 14th, 1642.

a movement of attack, or from some other cause,) two or three hundred spectators, who had come from London on horseback, returned suddenly, at a full gallop to the town: at the sight of this a panic manifested itself in the parliamentary army, desponding exclamations were heard, and many of the troops appeared disposed to forsake their colours and return to their homes. When the circumstance was explained, all faces regained their serenity, and indecision disappeared; an abundance of all kinds of provisions, and of wine and tobacco, sent by the women in the city to their husbands and sons, restored confidence and gaiety in the camp. But Essex positively refused to hazard anything on the strength of public enthusiasm; he recalled the regiments which had advanced, and took up a strictly defensive position; while the king, who dreaded an attack, his stock of ammunition being almost exhausted, effected his retreat without hindrance, first to Reading, and then to Oxford, where he established his winter quarters[y].

So much hesitation, and so many delays, against which the leaders of parliament struggled in vain, had more powerful causes than the wavering disposition of the soldiers, or the prudence of the general. The city itself was distracted with conflicting views and fears: a party who wished for peace, and which received great

[y] Whitelocke, p. 62, 63; Ludlow, Memoirs, vol. i. p. 58, in the Collection.

accessions from among the higher class of citizens, and from many others who had only given their consent to war with fear and sorrow, and because they did not know how to prevent it, now openly expressed its views. Already many petitions, which were otherwise urgent enough against popery and absolute power, supplicated parliament to treat for peace [z]. These petitions were suppressed, their authors were even threatened, but others were sent from the counties, and were addressed to the lords, who were thought better disposed to receive them [a]. On the other hand, petitions for the continuance of the war were not wanting, the magistrates and common council of the city had been renewed by recent elections, and the lower class of citizens and the people were devoted to the boldest leaders of the commons, and ardently embraced every opportunity to excite or uphold them. A shopkeeper named Shute came almost every day [b] to the bar of the house, followed by a numerous train, and entreated, in the name of 'the pious and movement party,' that war should be carried on with vigour. He was received with cordiality, and thanked for his zeal; but at length, his language became so imperious, and he spoke so insolently of the lords and officers of the army, that the house felt obliged to reprimand

[z] December 19th, 1642; Parl. Hist. vol. iii. col. 43.

[a] December 22nd, 1642; ibid. col. 46.

[b] November 13th, and 21st, December 9th, etc; Parl. Hist. vol iii. col. 12, 22, 37, etc.

him[c], for no one even yet dared to say or think the commons could separate from the lords, or could triumph without their support. To give, in appearance, some satisfaction to those who condemned the war, the house resolved that the common council should officially petition for peace, not from the parliament, but from the king himself; thus forcing upon him the trouble of giving an answer, which they were certain would not fail to displease the citizens[d]. The king, when they begged him to return to London, promising to suppress all riots, smiled, and said: "you cannot maintain peace there for yourselves"; and sent back the deputies with his answer, accompanied by a gentleman, whom he had charged to read it in his name to the general meeting of the city. An immense multitude were assembled[e]; lord Manchester and Pym were there ready to repel, in the name parliament, any imputation made by the king. At the sight of this noisy multitude, the king's commisioner was frightened, and wished to relinquish the task he had undertaken, alleging the weakness of his voice. But when summoned to discharge his duty, he obeyed, and was even forced to read the answer twice, in two different halls, that every one might hear it. After the second reading, a few royalists, who had

[c] December 11th, 1642; Parl Hist. vol. iii. col. 38.

[d] With the consent of both houses, commissioners were sent to Oxford on January 2nd, 1643.

[e] January 13th, 1643.

timidly stationed themselves just within the door, hazarded some little applause, but it was immediately drowned by violent murmurs. The king's letter was long and bitter, full of recrimination, and announced no wish for peace. Pym and lord Manchester replied, and their speeches were answered by a shout of "we will live and die with them." All petitions for peace, soon afterwards ceased[f]. The attempts of the royal party at reconciliation, led to no better result, yet they were constantly renewed, and kept Westminster, as well as the city, in a state of continual excitement; none at that time dreamt of quelling them by those acts of unbounded tyranny which give to parties for a few days, the possession of unlimited power, soon to be followed by a series of lasting troubles. Thus the parliament, forced to struggle against this inward disturbance, could not outwardly display its full energy, nor employ it freely in other conflicts.

This was not the case in the counties; party spirit there felt no curb, no general and decisive responsibility was attached to their acts; and political necessities and calculation neither regulated nor intimidated their ardour. So that, while in the neighbourhood of London the war seemed to languish, it raged in the country openly and spontaneously, and was carried on in each locality by the inhabitants on their own

[f] Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 110-116; Parl. Hist. vol. iii. col. 49-61.

account, and almost without any attention to what was passing between Oxford and the metropolis. In a few months the country was filled with warlike confederations, freely entered into by the inhabitants of a county, holding the same opinions, or by several adjoining counties, in order to support their cause by union. The first step taken by these confederations, was to request and receive from the king or the parliament, according to the party they espoused, a commission for their leaders, and the right to levy soldiers, impose taxes, in a word, to adopt all measures they considered necessary to insure success. After this they acted separately, and almost according to their own will, except occasionally giving an account at Oxford or in London of their situation and their deeds, and soliciting assistance and advice, as their case might need[g]. Where there were none of these local confederacies, sometimes even where they were, some rich and influential individual levied a body of men and carried on war as a partisan, sometimes in the

[g] Two of the most remarkable of these confederacies were, in the north, the counties of Durham, Northumberland, Cumberland, and Westmoreland, for the royal cause; and in the east, the counties of Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridge, Huntingdon, Bedford, Essex, Lincoln and Hertford for the parliamentary cause. There were several others, as in the centre, that of the counties of Northampton, Warwick, Leicester, Derby, and Stafford, for the parliament: in the south-east, that of the counties of Dorset, Somerset, Devon, and Cornwall, for the king, etc; Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 66, 94-98, 119, 381.

neighbourhood of his estate, or of the town in which he dwelt, and sometimes at a greater distance, according to his love of enterprise, his strength, or the necessity of the moment[h].

In other places, if more pacific dispositions for awhile prevailed, they were manifested with the same independence. In the counties of York and Chester, the two parties being nearly equal in strength, and thinking themselves more likely to injure each other, than that either could prevail, officially concluded a treaty of neutrality[i]; and nearly at the same time, at the opposite extremity of England, the counties of Devon and Cornwall solemnly promised to each other, by commissioners, to remain at peace, and to let the king and parliament settle the matter as they might[k]. But both the king and the parliament commned these conventions[l], and even those who had entered into them had presumed too much on their own mutual patience. Civil war soon raged as much in these counties, as in the rest of the kingdom. In the eastern, midland, and south-eastern counties, the most populous and wealthy, the parliamentary party was strongest; while in the north west and south-west, the king's cause prevailed; in these latter landed property was less divided, manufactures were scarcely known, the

[h] See Mrs. Hutchinson's, Memoirs, and also those of Ludlow.

[i] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion. vol. v. p. 238.

[k] In February, 1643; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion. vol. v. p. 235.

[l] Ibid. 240.

higher nobility were more influential, and the Roman catholic religion retained more adherents. But in both these portions of the kingdom, particularly that in which the king's influence prevailed, the weakest party was yet strong enough to keep its enemies in awe; and the parliament had this advantage, that the counties devoted to their cause were nearly all contiguous and compact, forming round London a girdle of defence; while the royalist counties, spread from the south-west to the north-east, from the land's-end in Cornwall, to the extremity of Durham, in a long and narrow line, broken at intervals by districts unfavourable to the king's cause, were much less united among themselves, could but rarely act in concert, and only on one side protected Charles's general quarters at Oxford, a place entirely devoted to himself, too far away and almost isolated in the midst of the enemy's territory.

A war of this kind, in the middle of winter, and in which the two principal armies remained nearly inactive, was not likely to bring about any speedy and decisive result. Every where, and every day, there were short and sudden expeditions, small places alternately captured and lost, others taken by surprise, both parties obtaining a nearly equal share of success and reverse[m]. The citizens daily became more ac-

[m] See Mrs. Hutchinson's, Memoirs, and those of Ludlow; May, Hist. of the Long Parl. vol. ii. p. 180 212.

customed to war, yet without becoming soldiers. Some of the leaders began to distinguish themselves by their courage, their talents, or their good fortune, but none of them were yet known by the whole nation; their fame and influence were local, as well as their exploits. Besides, notwithstanding the warmth of their passions, their manners were forbearing and gentle. Though the influence of the upper house and the higher nobility was fast declining, and the new power of the commons was the true cause of the national movement, it was against the king and his tyranny that the country had risen; the different classes of society were not at enmity, nor driven to the necessity of opposing each other, either in defence of themselves or their liberty. On both sides, and in most places, command was given to men of nearly equal rank, who, although at variance, had been brought up in the same habits and were capable of appreciating and respecting each other. The cavaliers were rapacious, licentious, and thoughtless, but not ferocious; and the presbyterians retained in the midst of their harsh fanaticism, a greater respect for the laws of humanity than civil discords have often witnessed. Relations, neighbours, and friends, ranking under different standards, did not entirely break off all connections, but lent each other assistance in case of need; though they met opposed in arms, they treated each other with courtesy, as men who who had formerly lived in peace, and who were

not separated for ever[n]. Prisoners were usually dismissed, under the simple promise not to serve again: if they happened to be left in a state of great distress, or if the king, with an air of cold indifference, suffered them to depart, it was looked upon as very hard treatment[o]; while the cruel brutality of prince Rupert caused so much surprise and gave so much offence, that even the multitude looked upon him with aversion and disgust, as a gross and hard-hearted foreigner. Thus, though war was everywhere present and active, it still remained free from those excesses which bring it so soon to a close; though both parties earnestly engaged in it, they still seemed afraid of giving each other too severe blows, and there was fighting in all parts of the kingdom, without the course of events becoming more rapid, and the king and parliament continued to lose their time in trifling debates, or vain negotiations.

Towards the middle of February, however, the queen's return, gave a rather more lively impulse to events. She had been in Holland more than a year, and during that time, had evinced a skill and activity rarely equalled in procuring assistance. The aristocratic party was then uppermost in the Netherlands; the stadtholder, her son-in-law, seconded her with all his power. Confident and adventurous when no immediate

[n] Mrs. Hutchinson's, Memoirs vol. i. p. 239-242; 327-331; Ludlow, Memoirs vol. i. p. 109-126, in the Collection.

[o] William Lilly, Observations on the Life and Death of king Charles, in M. Mazeres' Select Tracts, vol. i. p. 144, 145; Whitelocke, p. 64.

danger disturbed her mind; kind and seducing to those of whom she stood in need, she found means to interest this cold and republican people in her cause. In vain had the parliament sent over Mr. Walter Strickland, as an ambassador[p], to remind them of services formerly rendered to the United Provinces, and to request at least a strict neutrality. Strickland, after waiting a long time for an audience, obtained at last, and with great difficulty, a few equivocal declarations; the people openly manifested their dislike to his mission, and the queen continued the preparations for her departure without interruption[q]. A few vessels laden with arms, ammunition, officers, and even a few soldiers, accompanied her, and admiral Batten, to whom parliament had given orders to intercept this convoy, did not overtake them till they were disembarking at Burlington[r]; Batten cannonaded the place; the queen was lodged on the quay, the cannon balls fell upon her house, and even into the room where she was sleeping; she hastily got up, and fled into the country, where, it is said, she passed a few hours hid under a bank[s]. The whole country was filled with gossip respecting her courage and perils; lord Newcastle, with a body of troops, conducted her to York; the gentlemen surrounded her with

[p] In September, 1642.

[q] Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 157-163; Harris, Life of Cromwell, p. 250, in the note.

[r] February 22nd, 1643.

[s] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion. vol. v. p. 247. Memoirs of Madame de Motteville, vol. i. p. 273.

transport, and loudly expressed their indignation against the disloyal Batten, whom they accused of having designedly pointed his cannon to the very house in which she lodged; a great number of Roman Catholics came from all quarters to enlist in her ranks; in vain was this violation of the laws of the kingdom denounced to the king and parliament, and the appellation of the army of the queen and the papists[t], given to lord Newcastle's troops, with the hope of intimidating him; it was openly sanctioned by the king, and had been so for a long time[u]; he contemptuously dismissed all complaints, and retained his new soldiers. Indeed he soon found himself at the head of a considerable force. The queen continued to reside at York, not so anxious to join her husband, as she was delighted to command alone, and to preside without restraint over all the projects which were agitated in her court. Hamilton and Montrose came over from Scotland, to discourse with her on the means of engaging that kingdom in the king's cause; Hamilton, always conciliating and prudent, maintained that it was possible to gain the Scottish parliament, notwithstanding the decidedly adverse influence of the marquis of Argyle; Montrose, bold and presumptuous, proposed that under the command of the earl of Antrim, a powerful nobleman of the north of Ireland, who had also come to York to offer his

[t] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion. vol. v. p. 246.

[u] Bradie, History of the British Empire, vol. iii p. 489, in the note.

services, a body of Irishmen should land on the coast of Scotland, that the highlanders should be excited to rise and be put in arms, and the presbyterian chiefs massacred; offering himself to arrange and execute his projects.[x] The queen lent a ear to all these designs, secretly favouring the most violent, though careful to propitiate all who came to render homage to her power, at the same time she used all her endeavours to gain over some of the parliamentary leaders, who were already disgusted with their party, or influenced by their proximity to her; Sir Hugh Cholmondley, governor of Scarborough, who less than a month before had defeated a body of royalists, promised to deliver this town into her hands[y]; even Sir John Hotham seemed on the point of opening the gates of Hull to her, which before the beginning of the war he had so rudely shut against the king. In short, throughout the north the royalists were full of zeal and hope, the parliamentary party were silent and disquieted, and repeatedly wrote to London to beg for assistance and advice.

The parliament itself felt troubled: when the war first broke out it had indulged in the hope of obtaining immediate success. The increase of taxes excited murmurs[z]; reports of conspira-

[x] Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 353, 980; Baillie's Letters, vol. i. p. 304; May, Hist. of the Long Parl. vol. ii. p. 175.

[y] Towards the end of March, 1643.

[z] Parl. Hist. vol. iii. col. 77; the new taxes imposed on the city of London amounted to 10,000*l.* a week, and those on the whole kingdom to 33,518*l.* a week; Clarendon's Rebell. vol. v. p. 296.

cies spread in the city; and notwithstanding the absence of many members friendly to peace, it was never spoken of but it found many advocates even in the commons. The negotiations were not quite broken off; a proposition was made both to renew them, and, as a proof of sincerity, to disband the armies on both sides as soon as a treaty should be commenced: the motion was supported by Sir Benjamin Rudyard: "I have long feared," said he, "that this terrible cup, which has so long circulated from nation to nation in Europe, would at last be brought amongst us; it is now come, and it may be that we are destined to drain its bitterest dregs. From this, may God preserve us! one consolation remains to us, that our misery cannot be of long duration; we cannot fight here as they do in Germany, that vast continent, where war can rage around, and yet plenty of peaceable lands remain, where they may sow and reap and obtain a supply of food. But we are shut in on all sides by the sea, we fight as in a cockpit; we have no other ramparts than our own skulls and ribs to oppose to our enemies. It has been said in this house that we are in conscience obliged to punish the shedding of innocent blood; but who will answer for all the innocent blood which will yet be shed if we do not show our willingness for peace by means of an immediate treaty? Some have talked of trust in God; we might surely as well trust in God for a treaty of peace as for war; it is he who gives wisdom to nego-

tiate as well as courage to fight, according to his own divine pleasure. The effusion of blood is a crime which calls for vengeance, it stains a whole country: let us hasten to put a stop to it[a]." The motion was, however, rejected[b], but only by a majority of three voices, and the words of Rudyard were in the mouths of many well-disposed persons. The leaders of the commons secretly shuddered at the idea of seeing themselves obliged to solicit for peace, which they knew could only be obtained on conditions which would render it fatal. Yet they gave way; many even among their friends were so far dispirited as to look upon the national miseries as inevitable. On the 20th of March, after a few preliminary negotiations, five commissioners[c] departed for Oxford, charged to debate during twenty days, first for a suspension of arms, and afterwards for a treaty.

They were well received by the king; their intercourse with the court was noble and polite; the earl of Northumberland, president of the committee, affected to display great magnificence: he had brought with him all his servants, his plate, his wine; and provisions were sent to him from London: the royalists visited and

[a] Parl. Hist., vol. iii. col. 80.

[b] February 17th, 1643; there were two divisions in the house; in the first the motion was upheld by seventy-three voices against seventy-six; in the second by eighty-three against eighty-six; Parl. Hist., vol. iii. col. 79.

[c] The earl of Northumberland, Sir John Holland, Sir William Armyn, William Pierpoint, and Bulstrode; Whitelocke.

dined with him: the king even deigned to accept a few presents for his own table from him[d]. Some of the earl's coadjutors, who were simply members of the commons, took pleasure in appearing at Oxford with so much parade. But when negotiations commenced, these brilliant demonstrations were without effect: neither the parliament nor the king could accept the mutual conditions, for they were the same as those which had been so strenuously rejected before the war commenced; and they involved the giving up either party without defence into the hands of its adversaries. One evening the parliamentary commissioners hoped that they had at last obtained from the king a concession of some importance, probably on the subject of the militia; after a long conference he had appeared to be convinced, and was to give them a written answer the next morning. But to their great surprise it proved quite different from what had been agreed upon; and they learnt that before the king went to bed, the gentlemen of the bedchamber, the confidants of the queen, had, in the absence of his ministers, induced him to change his resolution[e]. "If the king," said Mr. Pierpoint, one of the commissioners, "would only treat favourably some of the lords attached to parliament, their influence might be of use to him." But Charles was haughty and unforgiving with his courtiers as well as with his people, and

[d] Whitelocke, p. 64.

[e] Ibid. p. 65.

would not even listen to a proposal which would compel him to restore the office of lord high admiral to the earl of Northumberland; thus intrigues for personal interest were as vain as would have been their success[f]. The king as well as the leaders of the commons had no wish for peace; he had promised the queen that he would never agree to it without her consent; and she wrote to him from York to dissuade him from it, already displeased that negotiations should have been opened in her absence, and declaring to her husband that she would leave England directly if she could not obtain a guard for her safety[g]. A petition against the suspension of arms, secretly set on foot by the king himself[h], was presented from the officers of the garrison of Oxford. In vain did some of the parliamentary commissioners, in private conversations, endeavour to excite his fears respecting the future; in vain did other commissioners, who came from Scotland to solicit the calling of a parliament in that kingdom, interpose their mediation[i]. He resented it as an affront, and forbade them to concern themselves with the affairs of England, and offered at last, as a peremptory answer to the commissioners, to return near the parliament, if they would appoint some

[f] Clarendon, Memoirs, vol. i. p. 217-224, in the Collection.

[g] Ibid. p. 225-229.

[h] Ibid. p. 216, 228.

[i] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. v. p. 325, etc.; Memoirs, vol. i. p. 229-235.

place for their future meetings and discussions, at least twenty miles from London. Upon the receipt of this message, both houses immediately recalled their commissioners, by so pressing an order that they set off the same day[k], though it was late and their travelling carriages were not ready[l].

Their behaviour at Oxford, particularly their intercourse with the king and the court, had inspired the partisans of war with much distrust. Lord Northumberland on his arrival heard that one of his letters to his wife had been intercepted and opened by Henry Martyn, a member of the committee of safety, notorious for having fled from Reading at the approach of the royal troops, and for the violence of his language. No nobleman was more tenacious of his dignity than the earl, nor exacted more deference from his fellow-citizens. Meeting with Martyn at Westminster he asked him the reason of such an insult; and, as Martyn in an ironical tone maintained that he had done right, the earl struck him with his cane in the presence of several spectators. The quarrel was brought before both houses, and received by the commons with some perplexity, by the lords with contempt, and was almost immediately hushed up[m]. Things were in that state in which every

[k] April 15th, 1643.

[l] Whitelocke, p. 65; Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 164-261; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. vi. p. 18.

[m] Parl. Hist., vol. iii. col. 109; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. vi. p. 18.

thing reveals and aggravates dissensions which every one would fain have concealed. Spring was coming on; whether peace was desired or feared, it was necessary to prepare for war. The day on which the commissioners returned to London Essex again took the field[n]. It was still Hampden's desire that he should march unexpectedly upon Oxford, besiege the king therein, and reduce him at once[o]. Even at Oxford alarm prevailed, and they talked of going to join the queen and lord Newcastle in the north. But Essex, whether he still mistrusted his strength, or was inwardly disturbed at the success he had obtained, again showed himself adverse to this bold counsel; he still encamped between Oxford and London, and contented himself with besieging Reading, a place which he considered as quite indispensable to the safety of parliament.

Reading submitted in ten days[p]; Hampden then once more proposed the siege of Oxford: Essex still persisted in his refusal[q]. Nothing was further from him than treason or fear, but he made war with regret, and the pleasures of popularity had already deserted him and did not enliven his reserve. Even before the beginning of the campaign, some displeasure had been

[n] April 15th, 1643, according to Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 265: the 17th of April according to May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. ii. p. 121.

[o] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. vi. p. 40.

[p] April 27th, 1643.

[q] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. vi. p. 49.

manifested against him in the commons, particularly in the committee of safety, the very focus of the party. The boldest had even gone so far as to question whether it would not be possible to supersede him, and the name of Hampden is said to have been mentioned as his successor[r]. Hampden was too wise to entertain even the idea of a power which nothing induced him to desire; whether capable or not of commanding, he only served under Essex as a colonel. But since the beginning of the war others had acquired a more independent and popular glory. In the north, Fairfax and his father, notwithstanding the superiority of lord Newcastle, daily disputed with him in the most gallant manner the dominion of that part of the country[s]. Lord Manchester, who was at the head of the confederation of the eastern counties[t], had not, it is true, fought against any royalist leader of renown, but he had often given the most valuable assistance to the parliamentarians of the north; well-trained bodies of militia were ready to follow him, and his frankness, his liberality, and his gentleness procured him the love of all the inhabitants. In the same counties, colonel Cromwell, already famous for many dexterous ex-

[r] Wood, Athenæ Oxoniensis, at the article 'Hampden.'

[s] See the Memoirs of Fairfax in the first part of M. Guizot's Collection.

[t] Lord Kimbolton, known also under the name of lord Mandeville, and who bore the title of lord Manchester since the death of his father, which took place on the 9th of November, 1642.

ploits, as well planned as successful, exercised over the minds of men of a bold spirit, of enthusiastic piety, and of a condition at once wealthy and obscure, an influence in which great genius and great power were already displayed. At last, in the south and west, the dispersion of several bands of royalists and the capture of seven places in the course of three months [u] had gained Sir William Waller the appellation of 'William the Conqueror [x].' The parliament, it was said, would not be at a loss to find either generals or men, and if lord Essex refused to conquer, some one could easily be found to conquer in his stead.

No propositions, not even any public insinuations, followed these bitter speeches. Essex was not merely an officer in the service of a discontented party; with him were connected those lords who were engaged in the war, the moderate who wished for peace, and the more clear-sighted presbyterians, in whose minds the more daring sectaries already caused some disquietude. Hampden himself, and the leaders of the political party, though they urged the earl to act with more vigour, had no design of separating from him. Thus discord did not openly break out, but, though concealed, it was already general, and Essex was not long without feeling its effects. Those who were forced outwardly to

[u] Chichester, Winchester, Malmsbury, Hereford, Tewksbury, Chepstow, and Monmouth.

[x] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. vi. p. 110.

support him, secretly threw every obstacle in his way; and his defenders, thinking they had done enough in declaring themselves for him, did not take the trouble to second his efforts. In a month he had to complain of the bad condition of his troops; they had neither pay, provisions, nor clothing; one tenth of his men, who at first had been so carefully looked after by the city, were now disabled by hardships and sickness. He made his situation known to the different committees whose duty it was to supply his wants; but his adversaries, more active and more constant in their endeavours than his friends, exercised the greatest share of influence among them; in short, it was by their eager activity that they had obtained authority, and all subaltern agents were of their own appointment. Thus all Essex's appeals were without effect[y]. The second campaign had scarcely opened, when the party who had assumed the king's prerogative felt it slipping from their grasp; another party existed which, though as yet obliged to remain silent, were nevertheless strong enough to reduce the great army of parliament to impotency, and so passionately bent on their purpose as to risk every thing in giving this advantage to their common enemy.

Already, and under the influence of similar feelings, another army was also forming. In those skirmishes which were daily taking place,

[y] May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. i. p. 124, 125, 156-161; Memoirs of Hollis, p. 10-13, in the Collection.

notwithstanding the negotiations and delays between Oxford and London, the parliamentary party had been frequently defeated. The cavalry of the royal party, in particular, struck terror into the opposite forces, and the cavalry was still, as in the feudal times, the most honoured and efficient part of the army. Hampden and Cromwell were talking one day of this inferiority of their troops: "How can it be otherwise," said Cromwell; "your horsemen are for the most part old worn out servants, tapsters, or people of that sort; theirs are the sons of gentlemen, and the younger sons of noblemen. Do you think that fellows of such low extraction as yours are, possess that spirit which will enable them to cope with gentlemen full of honour and resolution? Do not take my words amiss, I know you will not; but you must have men animated by a spirit which would lead them as far as gentlemen would go, otherwise I am sure you will always be beaten." "You are right," said Hampden, "but this cannot be." "I can do something towards it," said Cromwell, "and I will do it: I will levy men who will have the fear of God before their eyes, and who will bring some conscience to what they do; and I promise you they shall not be beaten[z]." And he accordingly went through the eastern counties, recruit-

[z] This conversation is related in a pamphlet of the time entitled 'Monarchy asserted to be the best form of government, in a conference at Whitehall between Oliver Cromwell and a committee of parliament;' published in London, in 1660, 8vo. pp. 38.

ing young men, of whom the greater part were known to him, and he to them; all freeholders or the sons of freeholders, to whom pay was not an object, nor idleness a pleasure; but all fierce and hardy enthusiasts, who engaged in the war for conscience' sake, and under Cromwell from the confidence they placed in him. "I will not deceive you," said he, "nor make you believe, as my commission expresses it, that you are going to fight for the king and parliament: if the king were before me I would as soon shoot him as another; and if your conscience will not allow you to do the same, go and serve elsewhere[a]." Generally they showed not the slightest hesitation, and were no sooner enlisted, than every indulgence to which they had been accustomed at home, as well as licence of the camp, were alike forbidden them; they were trained to the most severe discipline, tending their horses, carefully cleaning their arms and accoutrements, often sleeping in the open air, passing without relaxation from the duties of military service to exercises of piety; their commander obliged them to apply themselves to their respective callings, as well as to the duties of the service, fully determined that the free energy of fanaticism should be united to the prompt firmness of the soldier[b]. When the second campaign opened,

[a] Memoirs of the Protectoral House, etc. by Mark Noble, vol. i. p. 271, edit. of 1787.

[b] Whitelocke, p. 68; Mercurius Pragmaticus, of the 30th of May, 1648; Bates, 'Elenchus motuum nuperorum,' part 2, p. 220.

fourteen squadrons of these volunteers, forming a body of about a thousand men, served under Cromwell[c].

A month passed without any event of importance. The capture of Reading, so little thought of in London, had produced the greatest alarm at Oxford, and the king, instead of acting, was deliberating whether or not he should retire to more distant quarters. The parliament, troubled more than ever with their private dissensions, were more occupied with them than about their enemies. Sometimes they endeavoured to give satisfaction to all their adherents, violent or moderate, politicians or fanatics; sometimes decisive resolutions, obtained with great difficulty by a party, remained without being put into operation, and as if given up by common consent. The presbyterians had long demanded the fulfilment of the promise, that an assembly of divines should meet to reform the church: this assembly was convoked[d]; but the parliament named the hundred and twenty members of which it was to be composed: thirty laymen, ten lords, and twenty members of the commons were added to them, with the honours of precedency; ecclesiastics of very different opinions were called upon; and being without authority or independence, all that this assembly could do

[c] May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. ii. p. 199, in the Collection.

[d] By a decree of parliament of the 12th of June, 1643; they began to sit on the 1st of July following.

was to give its advice on questions upon which the house thought fit to consult it[e]. A charge of high treason was brought against the queen, and no one dared to oppose it; but after Pym had carried it to the upper house, it was no more heard of[f]. The want of the great seal daily obstructed the administration of justice, and many other public and private affairs. To remedy these inconveniences, and particularly to appropriate to themselves the legal attributes of sovereign power, the commons ordered that a new great seal should be prepared[g]; but the lords would not agree to it; more afraid of usurping the attributes of sovereignty in form than of exercising them in fact; the commons thought it prudent to suspend their entreaties[h]. Sometimes the various parties, voting together from different motives, joined in a deceptive and fruitless unanimity; more frequently, being nearly all of equal strength, they reciprocally reduced each other to impotency, and seemed to wait till some outward circumstance should force them to unite or separate for ever.

On the 31st of May, a fast day, both houses were in attendance at a sermon in St. Margaret's church, Westminster, when a note was delivered to Pym, who rose immediately; a very animated,

[e] Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. iii. p. 43, etc.

[f] May 23rd, 1643; Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 321.

[g] Towards the middle of May, 1643.

[h] Parl. Hist., vol. iii. col. 115, 117; May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. ii. p. 146.

though whispered conversation took place around him, and, without waiting for the end of the sermon, he hastily went out with his principal colleagues, leaving the congregation in a state of excitement only equalled by their ignorance and curiosity[1].

The sermon was no sooner over, than the houses met, and the public soon learnt that a dangerous conspiracy had just been discovered, in which several lords and members of the commons, and a great number of citizens were rumoured to be concerned. They proposed to arm the royalists, to seize the tower, the arsenals, and the principal posts, to arrest the leading members of both houses, and finally, to introduce the king's troops into London. That very day, May 31st, had been appointed for the execution of these designs. Every thing was soon to be discovered, for a committee had been appointed to trace out all the particulars of this plot, and several persons had already been arrested by their command[2].

Accordingly, in the course of the night and the next day, Edmund Waller[3], a member of the commons, and a poet of some celebrity, Mr. Thompkins his brother-in-law, who had formerly belonged to the queen's household, Mr. Challoner a rich citizen, and several others, were arrested and examined. All of them ac-

[1] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. vi. p. 66.

[2] Ibid.; State Trials, vol. iv. col. 627.

[3] Born May 3rd, 1605, at Coleshill in Hertfordshire; died October 21st, 1687.

knowledged, but with more or less details, the existence of a very extensive conspiracy, though some of the conspirators knew not its full extent or its true design. Some had only thought of refusing to pay the taxes; others wanted to present to both houses petitions for peace, numerously signed; others, again, had only assisted at a few meetings, or in the drawing up of certain lists of all the known citizens, distributing them into three classes, '*well meaning*, moderate, and *enemies*.' But notwithstanding these various designs, and their different importance and motives, the plot, which had for a long time been formed, had daily gained ground. It was now recollected, that more than three months before, in one of those numerous negotiations so often begun and interrupted, Waller had been one of the commisioners sent to Oxford, and that the day on which they were presented, he being one of the last who came forward, the king had received him with particular condescension, and said: "Mr. Waller, though the last, you are not the worst, nor the least in my favour[m]. From that time a constant correspondence had been carried on with Oxford; royalist merchants, who had left London, to escape the persecution of the commons, were its principal agents[n], a man by the name of Hall lived secretly at Beaconsfield to transmit messages; lady Aubigny, to

[m] Whitelocke, p. 66.

[n] Sir Nicholas Crisp, Sir George Benyon, &c.

whom the parliament had given permission to go to Oxford for her private affairs, had brought from thence in a little box a commission from the king, authorising some of the conspirators to levy men and money in his name; at last a message had been conveyed to Hall saying, "that the great vessel was come into harbour," meaning that every thing was ready; and Hall had informed lord Falkland of it, who had answered; "then let no time be lost, for the war every day becomes more difficult to repress [o]."

These were greater evidences of guilt than the justice of party spirit often seeks; and the parliament might, if they had chosen, have believed more. Seized with a cowardly wish of saving his life, at whatever price, Waller put every thing in action, money, confessions, and accusations, addressing the meanest, as well as the most powerful, for protection, supplicating all fanatics of any influence, to come and hear the humble profession of his repentance; as ready to exaggerate the extent of the plot, as he had perhaps been to exaggerate at Oxford the number and influence of the conspirators. Lord Portland and lord Conway had heard some of his secret conversations; he accused them, the earl of Northumberland, and many others were compromised by his answers [p].

[o] State Trials, vol. iv. col. 626-631. Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell. vol. vi. p. 57-79.

[p] May; Hist. of the Long Parl. vol. ii. p. 142; in the Collection; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell. vol. vi. p. 66.

Though few people were inclined to do that which was legally wrong, yet many had known and approved of what was going on. But parliament, with noble resolution, disdaining to take that advantage which the imprudence of their enemies and the meanness of an accomplice had given them, were content to believe that justice would be sufficient for their safety. Only seven persons were tried by a court martial; and, of five who were condemned, only two, Challoner and Tompkins, suffered death. They died like brave men [q], but without considering themselves martyrs; even evincing with touching sincerity some doubt, as to the righteousness of their cause; "I prayed God," said Challoner, as he ascended the scaffold, "that if this design redounded not to his honour he should give us to know it; God heard me." Tompkins said: "I am glad the plot has been discovered, for it might have led to misfortunes [r]." As for Waller, who had likewise been condemned, his life was granted as the recompense of his confessions, by the influence of some of his relations, among others of Cromwell, who was his cousin, and perhaps also through that lingering respect which is still paid to genius even when it only serves to render baseness more conspicuous [s].

[q] July 5th, 1643.

[r] State Trials, vol. iv. col. 632-635.

[s] Ibid. 635-638; May, Hist. of the Long Parl. vol. ii. p. 240, in the Collection.

For a few days, the leaders of the commons flattered themselves that the discovery and punishment of this conspiracy would produce a consternation at Oxford, intimidate the royalists in London, suspend the dissensions in the house, and, in a word, free their party from those troubles in which they had hitherto fruitlessly wasted their energy. But these hopes were soon frustrated; thanksgivings had scarcely been read in the churches, and a new oath of union in case of peril decreed, before the parliament found themselves agitated by greater reverses from without, and greater perils within.

The king heard without much concern, of the failure of the plot, nearly at the same time he received intelligence that his generals in the north, south, and west, had obtained several victories; and he would much rather obtain his triumph from the cavaliers and open war, than by underhand dealings with the citizens, who had formerly opposed his councils. On the 19th of June an unexpected event occurred, recalling his thoughts to London and the parliament. A report spread that the day before, in a rencontre of the cavalry, in which prince Rupert had surprised and beaten the parliamentarians, Hampden had been wounded: "I saw him," said a prisoner, "contrary to his usual custom, ride off the field, before the action was finished, his head hanging down and his hands leaning on his horse's neck; he is certainly wounded." The news caused a great sensation in Oxford,

though more curiosity than joy was manifested; none could believe that such a man had thus fallen under so unexpected a blow, and they hesitated to rejoice. The king himself, in the hopes of a negotiation, at first only thought of embracing this opportunity of conciliating if possible this powerful adversary, who had done him so much harm, but whom he thought capable of repairing every thing. Doctor Giles, a country neighbour of Hampden's, and who had kept up a familiar correspondence with him, was then at Oxford; the king said to him: "send and inquire for him, as if on your own account; if he has no surgeon, say mine are at his service." "Sir," replied the doctor, "I am little fitted for this business; every time I have requested any thing of Mr. Hampden, I have been to him as a bird of ill omen. I was asking him one day to cause legal proceedings to be instituted against some thieves who had robbed me; and, just as my messenger entered his house, he received intelligence of the death of his eldest son; on another occasion, I was again soliciting his intervention in another affair, when at the same moment a person arrived to announce to him the death of his beloved daughter Mrs. Knightley. Our intercourse has never been the forerunner of good." The doctor however undertook the king's commission. But when his messenger arrived on the 24th of June, he found Hampden almost lifeless; his shoulder had been fractured by two balls, and for six days he had suffered the most

excruciating agony. He was however told who sent to inquire for him, and with what intention. A great emotion agitated his whole frame, he attempted to speak, but failed, and died a few moments after. As soon as the king was certain of his death, he felt more pleasure than the knowledge of his being inclined to accommodation could have given him; and Hampden was no longer spoken of by the court at Oxford, but to recall his offences, or to remark triumphantly that he was killed in the same county and near the same place where he had first put in action the resolution of parliament concerning the militia, and levied men against the king[s].

On the other hand, in London and throughout the country, the deepest grief was manifested. Never had a man inspired a whole nation with so much confidence; all who belonged to the national party, no matter in what rank, or from what motives, looked up to Hampden for success to their cause; the most moderate entertained a high opinion of his prudence; the most violent, of his patriotism; the most honest, of his uprightness; the most intriguing, of his talents. Prudent and reserved, yet at the same time ready to brave every danger, he had been the cause of no misunderstanding; he still possessed the affection of all, when he was thus suddenly snatched from their hopes. His name was thus fixed for

[s] Warwick's Memoirs p. 198-200, in the Collection; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell. vol. vi. p. 85-91.

ever on that height, where the expectations of his contemporaries had placed it, a circumstance of rare occurrence, and which perhaps saved his virtue, as well as his glory, from the shoals on which revolutions often drive and wreck the most noble of their favourites.

His death seemed as a signal for the disasters which for more than two months continued without interruption to befall the parliament; daily aggravating the evil from which they arose. Essex's enemies in leaving his army totally unprovided, had placed undue reliance on the success of his rivals. While the general and his council were sending message after message to London, for money, clothes, ammunition, and arms[t], the news arrived that at Atherton-moor, in the north, Fairfax had just been defeated[u]; that Sir John Hotham, was on the point of surrendering Hull to the queen; that lord Willoughby could no longer hold out against lord Newcastle in Lincolnshire; and that the confederation of the eastern counties, the bulwark of parliament, would thus be thrown open to the enemy. It was far worse in the south-west; in one week Sir William Waller had lost two battles[x]; the peasants of Cornwall, descendants of the ancient Britons, had dispersed the parliamentary recruits in every rencontre; at Lans-

[t] Parl. Hist. vol. iii. col. 144-155.

[u] June 30th, 1643; Fairfax, Memoirs p. 367, in the Collection.

[x] That of Lansdown in Somersetshire, July 5th, 1643, and that of Roundway-down, in Wiltshire, the 13th of July following.

down, after having modestly begged permission, they attacked and carried a battery which had been considered inaccessible; and, a fortnight after, at the siege of Bristol, they scaled the walls with the same hardy intrepidity[y]. In this county, the land continued in the possession of its ancient proprietors; the same families had lived there for centuries, surrounded by the descendants of the ancient tenantry; and the people, being of a pious and artless disposition, were strangers to the new political views that generaly prevailed, and obedient without fear or servility to the influence of the nobility, feeling for their patrons and their old customs as much enthusiasm as the most zealous in the parliamentary party exhibited for their opinions and their rights[z]. Besides, in Cornwall and the neighbouring counties, resided some of the king's most judicious friends; the marquis of Hertford, brother-in-law to Essex, who had for a long time lived retired on his estate, through a dislike for court;—Sir Bevil Greenville, the most popular of those Cornish gentlemen, who all possessed popularity;—Sir Ralph Hopton, a man highly respected, as well as a brave officer, who sought no favours at Oxford, but severely repressed pillage, and every where protected the people; who conscious that he was thereby performing the duty of a faithful subject, did it with all the cheerfulness and alacrity of a good citizen. The

[y] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell. vol. vi. p. 119, 139.

[z] Sir Edward Walker's Discourses, p. 50.

credit of these generals, the courage of their soldiers, struck Waller's army with terror, and brought them into discredit; he could no longer maintain discipline, his troops deserted in whole companies; even the men sent by parliament to excite the zeal of the people, were seized with the same terror, and communicated it to those around them. The magistrates of Dorchester were one day showing the fortifications of their town to Mr. Strode, and asked him what he thought of them: "All that" said he "would not stop the cavaliers one half hour; they make nothing of scaling ramparts twenty feet high[a]. Dorchester surrendered to the royalists at the first summons[b]; Weymouth, Portland, Barnstaple, and Bedford, followed its example[c]; Taunton, Bath, and Bridgewater had already done the same[d]; Bristol, the second town in the kingdom, surrendered at the first attack[e], through the cowardice of Nathaniel Fiennes, although he stood high in parliament, as one of the leaders of the most violent faction. Every day the news of some misfortune reached London; while at Oxford, strength and security daily increased. The queen at last joined the king, bringing with her a few cannon, and three

[a] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell. vol. vi. p. 207.

[b] In August, 1643.

[c] Towards the end of August, 1643.

[d] Towards the end of July, 1643.

[e] July 25th, 1643; Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 284; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell. vol. vi. p. 136-148; State Trials, vol. iv. p. 186-293.

thousand men[f]. Their first inteview took place on Keynton common, the field on which the first affair between the two parties had taken place in the preceding year; and, on the very same day[g], at the same hour, Wilmot and Hopton obtained a brilliant victory over the parliamentary army[h] at Roundway-down[i]. Charles and the queen entered Oxford in triumph; while Waller, who, when he set out to join his army, had ordered all the constables of the places through which he passed to hold themselves in readiness to receive his prisoners, returned to London without soldiers[k].

Essex still remained inactive, retorting the blame on those who reproached him for it; he was present at many defeats, without either partaking of them, or endeavouring to prevent them. At last, he wrote to the upper house[l]; "I think if it should please your lordships, that you would do well to apply to the king, with the view of obtaining peace, with proper guarantees for the religion, laws, and liberties of subjects, and also for the just punishment of the principal delinquents who have been the cause of so much misery to this kingdom. If a treaty be not the result, it will be necessary I think to beg of his

[f] Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 274.

[g] July 13th, 1643.

[h] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell. vol. vi. p. 130-135; Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 285.

[i] In Wiltshire.

[k] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell. vol. vi. p. 137.

[l] July 9th, 1643.

majesty to retire from this scene of bloodshed, and let the two armies fight out the quarrel in one day [m]." Had this letter arrived a few days sooner, it would have been well received: at the news of the first defeats, the lords had solemnly protested their fidelity to the king, and prepared new proposals of peace [n]; the commons, on the contrary, more irritated than cast down, had at last summoned the upper house to adopt their resolution concerning the great seal; and, on their refusal, had ordered one to be engraved, bearing on one side the arms of England and Ireland, and on the other a representation of the house of Commons sitting at Westminster, without any symbol to represent the lords [o]. In such a state of discord, it is probable that the peers would have listened to the pacific proposals of the general. But about the same time [p], the king, flushed with his success, officially declared that the individuals assembled at Westminster no longer formed two real houses; that the retirement of so many members, and the want of freedom of debate, had deprived them of all legal existence; that for the future he should no longer honour them with the name of parliament; finally, he forbade all his subjects to

Journals of the house of Lords, July 11th, 1643; Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 290; Whitelocke, p. 67.

[n] June 16th, 1643; Parl. Hist. vol. iii. col. 132.

[o] In the first days of July; Parl. Hist. vol. iii. col. 143; Whitelocke, p. 67.

[p] July 20th, 1643.

render any obedience to this set of seditious traitors[q]. This violent and general reprobation suddenly reestablished concord between the two houses. On July 5th they voted that commissioners should be sent to their brethren the Scots, to beg them to send an army to the succour of the English protestants, who were in danger of falling under the yoke of the papists[r]; and when Essex's letter was read in the house of lords, they declared that they would send neither petition nor pacific proposals, till the king should have recalled the proclamation in which he declared that the two houses no longer formed a free and legal parliament[s].

Essex did not urge his advice farther; honest and sincere, in councilling peace he thought he had fulfilled a duty; besides, he respected the parliament, and when once he had given his council, far from pretending to dictate to them, he awaited their pleasure. For a few days the most perfect union seemed to reign in London among all parties; all joined to overwhelm lord Essex with marks of esteem; he speedily received ammunition and reinforcements[t]; at the same time, Waller, notwithstanding his disasters, was thanked for his courage and treated with honour as a man whose services would again be required[u]. In the eastern counties the levying

[q] Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 331.
[r] Parl. Hist. vol. iii. col. 144.
[s] Journals of the house of lords, July 11th, 1643.
[t] Parl. Hist. vol. iii. col. 144.
[u] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell. vol. vi. p. 185.

of another army was ordered to be placed under the command of lord Manchester, and Cromwell as lieutenant-general [x]. Lord Fairfax was sent to replace Hotham [y], who, when his intentions were made known to the commons [z], had been arrested at Hull [a], and conveyed to the Tower, where he awaited his sentence. The commissioners for Scotland were named, two by the lords, and four by the commons [b], they were entreated to hasten their departure. Most of the members of the assembly of divines also left London for their parishes, to calm the fears of the people, and excite them to fresh efforts [c]. Every day, in the presence of a multitude of mothers, sisters, and children, a special service was read in one of the churches of the city, to supplicate the protection of God, for all who devoted themselves to their country's cause [d]; and every day, at the sound of a drum, crowds of citizens, men and women, rich and poor, came

[x] July 22nd, 1643; Parl. Hist. vol. iii. col. 156; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell. vol. vi. p. 186. This army was to be composed of ten thousand men.

[y] July 3rd, 1643; Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 280; Journals, etc., July 11th.

[z] At the beginning of June, 1643.

June 29th, 1643; Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 275-277; Whitelocke, p. 67.

[b] The lords Grey de Wark and Rutland, Sir William Armyne, Sir Henry Vane, Mr. Hatcher, and Mr. Darley; Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 466.

[c] Parl. Hist. vol. iii. col. 148; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebell. vol. vi. p. 189.

[d] Neal, Hist. of the Puritans vol. ii. p. 506.

to work at the fortifications of the city[e]. Never in the house and among the people had so much energy been displayed, with so much prudence and unanimity.

But the danger still increased; the king was still everywhere successful. Notwithstanding public applause, some refused to compromise themselves any longer for the parliament; lord Grey of Wark, one of the commissioners appointed by the upper house to go to Scotland, evaded the employment[f]; the lords sent him to the Tower: the earl of Rutland, who was to have accompanied him, also made an excuse, alleging the state of his health[g]. The commissioners appointed by the commons were obliged to depart alone[h]; and they could go no otherwise than by sea, the roads to the north not being safe, and Fairfax not strong enough to afford them an escort. They were twenty days on their voyage[i]. In the mean time the king received more prudent advice, and published a milder proclamation. With the hope, the wish for peace returned. On the 4th of August, on the motion of the earl of Northumberland, the lords framed some proposals to the king, more moderate than any which had hitherto been discussed; they voted that both armies should be

[e] May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. ii. p. 217, in the Collection.
[f] July 17th, 1643; Parl. Hist., vol. iii. col. 148.
[g] Parl. Hist. vol. iii. col. 150. [h] Ibid.
[i] They left London on the 20th of July, and arrived in Scotland the 9th of August following; Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 466.

immediately disbanded, and those members who had been expelled for joining the king, recalled; but left the question of the militia and the church to a future decision, the one by a synod and the other by a parliament. The very next day they transmitted these proposals to the commons, declaring, in rather a haughty tone, that it was high time to put an end to the calamities of the country[k]. Surprised by this unexpected attack, the party who wished for war vainly insisted on the danger of thus losing the fruit of those efforts and troubles which had been already endured merely to obtain a few months' respite. In vain they requested a postponement till an answer should be received from Scotland. "It is true," they replied, "that the lower orders of people appear disposed for war; but it is evident that the rich and respectable citizens will no longer encourage it, since they refuse to grant loans for its support. What harm can there be to address reasonable proposals to the king? if he accept them, we shall have peace; if not, his refusal will buy more men and money for us than all your decrees." It was resolved by ninety-four

[k] In the conference which took place between the two houses (August 5th, 1643) the speaker of the house of lords began in the following terms: "Gentlemen, the lords think that it is too evident to the understanding of any one, that this kingdom, with all the wealth that a long and happy peace has given it, is near falling into the desolation and distress which accompany civil war, and that those men who should devote to its prosperity their hearts and strength, put it in peril by their unnatural dissensions, etc.; Parl. Hist., vol. iii. col. 156.

voices against sixty-five, that the proposals of the lords should be taken into consideration[k].

This resolution sadly distressed the movement party; peace thus sought for in the midst of so many reverses, would not be a treaty but a defeat; it exposed all public and private interests to the most imminent dangers, destroyed all the hopes of the patriots who desired a more extensive reform, and those of the ambitious whose object was a revolution. They resolved to do all in their power to oppose it. On the evening of the sixth of August, although on a Sunday, the lord mayor, Pennington, whom the king's proclamation had excluded from all amnesty, assembled the common council of the city; and the next day a threatening petition required the commons to reject the proposals of the lords, and to adopt in their stead a resolution of which lderman Atkins, the bearer of the petition, devered a copy[l]. An immense multitude, aprised of the proceedings of the common council y small pamphlets which had been distributed ı every part of the city, backed them by their. ıouts and cries. The lords made shift to reach Westminster through this mob, but complained of it to the commons, declaring that they would adjourn to the next day, and would then adjourn again if these outrages were not repressed. But the commons had already entered upon the con-

[k] Parl. Hist., vol. 3, col. 156-158; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. vi. p. 178-182.

[l] Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 336.

sideration of the proposals of peace; after a long debate, eighty-one voted in their favour, and only seventy-nine against them. The tumult increased to the highest degree; in the street the people cried that they would not disperse until they received a favourable answer; within, the opponents of peace violently demanded another division, maintaining that there was some mistake, and that they would not thus be trifled with. Their wish was complied with: the house again divided; eighty-one members again persisted in demanding peace; but the tellers for the opposition declared their number to be eighty-eight; the speaker immediately announced this result, and the partisans of peace left the house dumb with amazement and fear [m].

Three days after, on the 9th of August, they resolved to retaliate. A mob of two or three thousand women assembled early in the morning around Westminster, wearing white ribands on their heads as an emblem of peace, and requesting by a petition, full of lamentation [n], that it should be obtained. Sir John Hippisley came out and told them that the house also wished for peace, and hoped soon to procure it, but that they must for the present retire to their homes. The women however remained: at twelve o'clock their number amounted to five thousand; a few men in women's clothes were

[m] Parl. Hist., vol. iii. col. 158-160; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. vi. p. 182-184.

[n] See this petition, in Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 357.

amongst them, and, at their instigation, a large party penetrated to the doors of the house of commons, crying, "Peace! Peace!" The guard, consisting only of a few of the militia, urged them to retire; but this only increased their violence, and they cried out, "Let the traitors who oppose peace be given up to us, we will tear them to pieces! give us that rascally Pym!" They were pushed back to the bottom of the stairs, and a few firelocks discharged in the air to frighten them; "It's only powder!" they said, and commenced pelting the militia with stones. A real discharge was then fired at them, and a squadron of horse coming up at the time, charged upon the crowd, sword in hand; for a moment the women still seemed determined; they crowded together in all directions to make way for the cavalry, who made a charge among them with blows and imprecations. They were now forced to retreat; and after a few minutes of most dreadful tumult, there remained near Westminster only seven or eight women wounded and weeping, and two lying dead. One of these, well known by the people, had from her childhood sung the old ballads of the country in the streets of London[o].

The victory was complete, but dearly purchased; fraud and violence had been resorted to, means which disgrace success, particularly when reform is made in the name of the laws and pro-

[o] Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 357; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. vi. p. 184.

fesses to re-establish them in proper force. It was already a common saying, that the parliament had rendered itself guilty of every crime with which the king had been reproached. The upper house was irritated, and the blood of the people had been spilled; private animosities began to surmount every other feeling. The leaders of the commons were informed that a certain number of members, under the influence of the principal lords, were preparing to leave London to seek refuge in Essex's camp, enter into negotiations with Oxford, and proclaim that they had forsaken a parliament governed by the mob. The design was not accomplished, Essex being too honest to connive at it; and the party was relieved from great anxiety when they learnt that their general had no intention to betray them[p]. But the lords Portland, Lovelace, Conway, Clare, Bedford, and Holland, nevertheless left London and joined the king; the earl of Northumberland retired to his castle at Petworth[q]. These illustrious names, though they did not constitute the strength of parliament, had served as a shield and lent brilliancy to it. Astonished to find themselves alone, some of the citizen chiefs seemed almost intimidated; Pym himself was accused of holding correspondence with the enemy[r]. On the other side, the most violent demagogues, the most outrageous zealots,

[p] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. vi. p. 188, 200, 203.
[q] Ibid. vol. iii. p. 189.
[r] Whitelocke, p. 68.

began to give expression to their secret feelings; John Saltmarsh, afterwards made chaplain in Fairfax's army, maintained, that at any rate the union of the king and the people must be prevented, and that, if the king would not concede every thing they desired, he should be extirpated, both he and his race, and the crown awarded to another. The pamphlet in which this language was held forth, was reported to the house of commons, but Henry Martyn spoke in its defence. "I see," said he, "no reason to condemn Mr. Saltmarsh; certainly the ruin of one family is better than that of a great many." "I beg," said Sir Nevil Pool, "that Mr. Martyn should be ordered to explain to what family he alludes." "I mean the king and his children," replied Martyn, without hesitation[s]; a violence of speech till then unprecedented, and which the party who professed it were far from being able to sustain. No new scame from Scotland; they did not even know whether the commissioners had arrived or not, and they daily feared to learn that the king was marching towards London, or that he had besieged Gloucester; the last place left to parliament in the west of the kingdom, and the only one which interrupted the communications of the royal army from the south-west to the north-east of the kingdom, and prevented their bringing their united forces to act together[t].

[s] September 9th, 1643; Parl. Hist. vol. iii. col. 165.

[t] Whitelocke, p. 69.

Passions were controlled by danger; the parties coolly surveyed their situation. Neither one nor the other was strong enough easily to overthrow their adversaries, and find themselves afterwards in a state in which they could with advantage make either war or peace. Instead of seeking deliverance, the moderate in weakness, the zealots in frenzy; the former understood that before they treated they must conquer, and the latter, that to be victorious it was their duty to serve and that of their rivals to command. A committee, in which were included some of the warmest partisans of war[u], went to Essex[x], informed him of the measures which had just been taken to recruit and provide every necessary for his army, inquired what else he stood in need of; and in short, delivered the destiny of the nation into his hands, with the most signal proofs of the entire trust reposed in him by the parliament. The earl and his friends showed themselves, on their side, as desirous of war as if they had never formed any other wish[y]: Hollis, who had obtained a passport for himself and family to retire to the continent, had it recalled, and remained in England; everywhere those persons who had once been accused of cowardice or treason, took the lead in making

[u] Saint John, Strode, and Crew; to which, after some opposition, was added Mr. Pym.

[x] The 4th of August, 1643; Journals of the House of Commons, 3rd, 15th, and 16th of August; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. vi. p. 187.

[y] Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 291.

preparations, efforts, and sacrifices; while their fiery adversaries, now reserved and humble, without display, seconded them with the warmest zeal. They even allowed Henry Martyn to be sent to the Tower for his last transgression[z], without offering much opposition, so firm was their resolution of sacrificing everything for a transient unanimity, the only means of safety. This judicious conduct was not fruitless; while Waller and Manchester were separately engaged in forming an army of reserve, men, money, and provisions of all sorts, were levied with astonishing rapidity to be conveyed to Essex, whose troops alone could be put in a state to return speedily to the field; four regiments of the London militia were to serve under him; and on the 24th of August, after a solemn review on Hounslow heath, in presence of nearly all the members of both houses, the earl departed at the head of fourteen thousand men, intending, by forced marches, to go to the assistance of Gloucester, which it was feared the king had closely blockaded for the last fortnight[a].

Charles now much regretted that he had not, after his victories, made a more decisive attempt on London itself; a resolution to that effect having been formed on a plan which seemed to promise certain success: the king was to have advanced from the west, while lord Newcastle,

[z] The 16th of August, 1643; Parl. Hist., vol. iii. col. 161.

[a] May, Hist. of the Long. Parl., vol. ii. p. 241; Hollis, Memoirs, p. 16, in the Collection.

who had been victorious in Yorkshire, was to have come from the north, and thus the two great royalist armies would have met under the walls of the city. After the capture of Bristol, Charles immediately sent Sir Philip Warwick, one of his most faithful adherents, to lord Newcastle to acquaint him with his plan, and request him to prepare accordingly. But the lords attached to the king's party were not generals whom he could command at his pleasure: they held their commission, not their power, from the king; and satisfied with upholding his cause in places where their influence prevailed, had no wish to remove, and thus risk the loss of their independence and their means of success. Newcastle, proud and profuse, fond of display and leisure, dreaded the fatigue and wearisomeness of controversy; and being himself surrounded by a little court, in which the elegance of his mind and manners attracted men of agreeable intercourse, he neither wished to join the crowd of courtiers at Oxford, nor to be lower in command in the king's army than so gross and ill-educated a stranger as prince Rupert. After having coldly listened to the proposals brought by Warwick, he said, "I remember the history of the rebellious Irishman, Tyrone, who was taken prisoner by the lord-lieutenant Mountjoy, and brought to queen Elizabeth; when he saw that at Whitehall the lord-lieutenant was scarcely noticed, and was waiting with the rest for the queen's appearance, he turned towards one of his

countrymen and said, 'How ashamed I am of having been made a prisoner by a man whom I thought powerful, but whom I now see confounded in the crowd, and mean enough to dance attendance on a woman',—for my part, as long as Hull remains in the hands of the enemy, I cannot leave Yorkshire[b]." Warwick reported this answer to the king, who dared not resent it. He was still advised by some to march upon London; it was even the queen's opinion that he ought to do so; but the king had not much taste for dangerous enterprise, not that he feared danger, but he feared he should compromise his dignity; his pride had already been wounded the preceding year, when, after the battles of Edgehill and Brentford, he had been obliged to retrograde. Many good officers advised the siege of Gloucester, some with disinterested views, others in the hope of a rich booty; colonel William Legg even boasted that he was upon a safe footing of intelligence with Edward Massey, the governor of the place[c]. The king at last resolved upon the siege, and on the 10th of August his army, commanded by himself in person, occupied the heights around the town, in which there were only fifteen thousand men in garrison, besides the inhabitants.

Immediately upon arriving before the place, he summoned the governor to surrender, allow-

[b] Warwick's Memoirs, p. 200, 202, in the Collection; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. vi. p. 191.

[c] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. vi. p. 169-173.

ing him two hours for his answer. But before that time had elapsed, two messengers, the sergeant-major Pudsey and a citizen, arrived at the camp, both pale and thin, with their heads shaved and dressed in black; they brought, they said, an answer from the godly city of Gloucester, and being immediately introduced to the king, they read in his presence a letter, which run thus: "We, the inhabitants, magistrates, officers, and soldiers within this garrison of Gloucester, unto his majesty's gracious message return this humble answer, 'That we do keep this city, according to our oath and allegiance, to and for the use of his majesty and his royal posterity; and do accordingly conceive ourselves wholly bound to obey the commands of his majesty signified by both houses of parliament; and are resolved, by God's help, to keep this city accordingly.'" On hearing this brief reply, delivered in a firm shrill tone, without the slightest appearance of agitation, and at the sight of the uncouth messengers who stood motionless before the king, coolly awaiting his answer, feelings of surprise, anger, and derision were ready to burst from the spectators around; but Charles, as grave as his enemies, repressed their expression with a look, and dismissed the deputies in these few words: "If you expect help, you are deceived; Waller has been completely routed, and Essex cannot march." They had scarcely re-entered the town before the in-

habitants set on fire the suburbs, thus leaving themselves nothing to defend but that which was within the walls[d].

For twenty-six days[e], by their indefatigable valour, they frustrated all the efforts of the besiegers; except a hundred and fifty men, who were held in reserve, the whole garrison were constantly on foot; in all their labours and dangers the citizens afforded ready assistance to the soldiers, the women helped their husbands, and the children their mothers. Massey even ordered frequent sallies, and only three men took advantage of this opportunity to desert[f]. Tired of so long a delay, which neither brought them glory nor rest, the royal army, in a spirit of revenge, licentiously devastated the country around; the officers frequently employing their men to seize some rich farmer or peaceable freeholder of the opposite party, who could only regain his liberty by paying a ransom[g]. In the camp the want of discipline, and without, the hatred of the people, daily increased. An assault might have been attempted; but that of Bristol was so recent and had cost so dear, that none dared to propose it. In short, the king only

[d] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. vi. p. 173-176; May, Hist. of the Long. Parl., vol. ii. p. 230-234, in the Collection; Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 286.

[e] From the 10th of August to the 5th of September, 1643.

[f] May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. ii. p. 234, 240; Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 287-290; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. vi. p. 219.

[g] Clarendon, ibid.

looked for success by starving out the garrison and town by a long siege, when, to his extreme surprise, he heard that Essex was marching to its relief. Prince Rupert vainly endeavoured to check his progress; the earl advanced without suffering himself to be turned from his road, driving Rupert and his cavalry before him. He was already within a few miles of the besiegers, and the king's cavaliers had given way to the advanced ranks of his infantry, when, to delay him if possible for only a day, Charles sent him a messenger with proposals of peace: "The parliament," answered Essex, "did not charge me to negotiate, but to deliver Gloucester; I will do it, or leave my body beneath its walls[h]!"—"No proposals! no proposals!" shouted the soldiers when they saw the messenger arrive. Essex continued his march, and the next day, the 5th of September, as he was disposing his army on the heights of Presbury, about six miles from Gloucester, the sight of the king's quarters in flames, informed him that the siege was raised[i].

He hastened to enter the town, taking with him provisions of all kinds; he loaded the governor and his soldiers with praise, congratulated the citizens on their courage, which, by giving him time to come to their succour, had saved

[h] May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. ii. p. 243-246; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. vi. p. 223; Whitelocke, p. 69; Rushworth, part 3, p. 292.

[i] The 8th of September, 1643; May, Hist. of the Long. Parl., vol. ii. p. 247.

the parliament; and he received himself, as he passed the streets, in the church, and under his windows, demonstrations of the most passionate gratitude. After having spent two days at Gloucester, his mission being accomplished, he returned to London[k]; for it was not of much less importance that he should now march back to the parliament the only army capable of protecting it.

Everything seemed to promise him a retreat as favourable as his expedition had been: for several days he deceived his enemies as to the road he had taken; Cirencester, with a rich magazine of provisions, fell into his hands; in short, his cavalry had borne with glory the dreaded attacks of prince Rupert, when, as he drew near Newbury, on the 19th of September, he found that the enemy had outdone him, that they occupied the town and the neighbouring heights, that the road to London was barred against him, and that nothing but a battle could throw it open. The king himself was at the head of his army, which had taken up an advantageous position, being open to the garrisons of Oxford and Wallingford for any supplies he might need. The country, nothing disposed in favour of parliament, carefully concealed all their provisions. So that whatever the chances of a battle might be, it must be risked, as much to get forward as to save themselves from famine.

[k] The 10th of September.

Essex did not hesitate; the next morning[1] at daybreak, placing himself at the head of his advanced guard, attacked the principal hill and dislodged the regiments which occupied it. Engaging by turns with every corps and against every position, the battle lasted till night, and was so valiantly disputed that both parties took pride in commending the valour of their enemies. The royalists were excited by the desire to repair a defeat which had interrupted the course of their victories, their adversaries by the hope of not losing the object which they had now so nearly attained, the fruit of a victory which had turned the fortunes of the war. The London militia in particular performed prodigies of valour; prince Rupert, after having broken Essex's horse, twice charged upon them, without their ranks, bristling with spears, appearing to be in the least disordered. The generals, Essex, Skippon, Stapleton, Merrick, exposed themselves as much as the commonest soldiers, while the servants and attendants of the army, who were on the field, fought with as much valour as the bravest officers. At night both armies retained their position. Essex had gained ground, but the royal troops still blocked up his passage, and he expected to have to renew the attack next day, when, to his great astonishment, the first dawn of morning showed him his enemies retreating and the road clear. He hastened to make the most of it; and the second day after

[1] The 20th of September, 1643.

the battle took up his quarters at Reading, clear from all danger[m].

The violence of this engagement dispirited the royalists, who were not inferior in courage but far less obstinate than their adversaries, and quite as ready to despond as to hope. Their loss had been great, and such as made a deep impression upon their imagination. More than twenty officers of distinction had fallen, some illustrious by their merit as well as their rank; lord Sunderland, who, though scarcely twenty-three, was much beloved by the wise and good protestants of his party[n]; lord Carnarvon, an excellent officer, most invaluable to the king for the strict discipline he maintained, beloved by the soldiers for his justice, and so scrupulous an observer of his word, that nothing could induce him to continue in the army of the west after prince Maurice, who commanded it, had violated the capitulations made with the towns of Weymouth and Dorchester[o]; lastly, lord Falkland, the pride of the royalist party, a sincere lover of his country, though proscribed by the parliament, and respected by the people although a minister at Oxford[p]. His duty did not require his presence on

[m] Rushworth, part 3, vol. ii. p. 293, 294; May, Hist. of the Long Parl., vol. ii. p. 250; Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. vi. p. 227-231; Whitelocke, p. 91; Ludlow's Memoirs, vol. i. p. 72, in the Collection.

[n] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. vi. p. 233.

[o] Ibid. p. 233-235.

[p] Born in 1610, at Burford, in Oxfordshire; he was thirty-three years of age.

the field of battle, and his friends had more than once reproached him with his uncalled for temerity; "My office," he would answer with a smile, "cannot deprive me of the privileges of my age, and a secretary of state and war should be acquainted with the greatest dangers." For the last few months he had sought them with ardour; the present sufferings of the people, the greater evils which he foresaw, the anxiety that preyed upon his mind, the ruin of his hopes, the continual disquietude he suffered amongst a party whose success he dreaded almost as much as its defeat; everything had contributed to plunge him into bitter despondency; his temper was soured; his imagination, naturally gay and splendid, had become melancholy and continually fixed on one object; inclined by taste as well as habit to a distinguished elegance in dress, he had ceased to take any care either of his apparel or his person; no conversation, no employment had any longer any charms for him; he often sat for hours with his head upon his hand, and only started from his silent reverie to exclaim sorrowfully "Peace! Peace!" The hope of some negotiation could alone reanimate him. On the morning of the battle those who saw him were astonished to find him more cheerful than he had been for a long time; he seemed to have given an unusual attention to his dress, and said, "If I should be killed to-day, I am anxious that they should not find my body in dirty linen." His friends conjured him to

stay from the battle, "No, no," he said, his features immediately reassuming their sorrowful expression, "I am weary, all this has too long weighed upon my heart; I hope I shall be out of it before night." He immediately placed himself in the first rank of lord Byron's regiment as a volunteer. The action had not long commenced, when a ball struck him; he fell from his horse, and died without any one having observed his fall. He was the victim of times too rough for his pure and sensitive mind. His body was not found till the next day; his friends, Hyde in particular, ever preserved an inconsolable remembrance of his death; the courtiers heard without much emotion the death of a man who was a stranger to them; Charles manifested a decent regret, and felt himself more at ease in the council[q].

Essex had scarcely arrived at Reading before a deputation from both houses came to him with an expression of their gratitude, to provide for the wants of his army, and to inquire into his wishes[r]. Not only were the parliament saved, but they could look to the future and think themselves safe from like perils. The same success had attended their negotiations; while Essex was raising the siege of Gloucester, Vane had arrived at Edinburgh, and entered into a close

[q] Clarendon, Hist. of the Rebellion, vol. vi. p. 235-250; Whitelocke, p. 70.

[r] September 24th, 1643; Journals of the House of Commons, September 23rd; Whitelocke, p. 70.

alliance with the Scots. Under the name of 'solemn league and covenant,' a political and religious treaty, which devoted the united strength of both kingdoms to the defence of the same cause, was voted on the same day by the convention of the states and the general assembly of the church of Scotland[s]: early the next morning, Scottish commissioners departed for London, where both houses, after having consulted the assembly of divines, also sanctioned the covenant[t]; and, a week after[u], in the church of St. Margaret, Westminster, all the members of parliament, standing with their hats off, and one hand raised to heaven, took the oath of adherence, first verbally, and then signed a written declaration[x]. The covenant was received in the city with the most fervent enthusiasm; it promised a reform of the church and a speedy succour of 21,000 Scots; the presbyterians thus at once saw their fears dissipated and their wishes fulfilled. The day after this solemnity[y], Essex entered London; the house of commons, preceded by the speaker, went in a body to Essex

[s] August 17th, 1643; Burnet, Memoirs of the Hamiltons, p. 239; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. iii. p. 56-62; Baillie, Letters, vol. i. p. 381.

[t] September 18th, 1643; Parl. Hist., vol. iii. col. 169.

[u] September 25th, 1643.

[x] Parl. Hist., vol. iii. col. 173; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, vol. iii. p. 62; Rushworth, part iii. vol. ii. p. 475-481. The covenant was signed by two hundred and twenty-eight members of the commons.

[y] September 26th, 1643.

house, to compliment him; the lord mayor and the aldermen, in scarlet robes, also waited upon him with the thanks of the city "to the saviour and protector of their lives, their fortunes, their wives, and children." The flags which had been taken from the royal army at Newbury were exposed to public view; one in particular attracted much attention; it bore a representation of the interior front of the house of commons, with the heads of two criminals placed at the top with this inscription; '*Ut extra, sic intra*[z].' The people thronged around these trophies; those who had taken part in the expedition related all the details; everywhere, in domestic conversations, in sermons, in the groups formed in the streets, the name of Essex was loudly proclaimed or piously blessed. The earl and his friends resolved to make the most of this triumph. He went to the peers, offered to resign his commission, and begged that he might be allowed to retire to the continent[a]: he said public danger no longer required his stay; he had endured too many bitter annoyances in his command; he foresaw that they would be shortly renewed, for Sir William Waller still possessed a commission independent of his control, and while the title of general-in-chief left him the whole responsibility, another had the right to withhold obedience; he had too long known the torments of this situa-

[z] Whitelocke, p. 71.

[a] October 7th, 1643; Journals of the House of Lords.

tion, and he could no longer endure it. Upon hearing this, the lords were astonished, or feigned to be so, and immediately voted that they would summon the commons to a conference; but at the very moment a message arrived which rendered such a measure useless: being informed of all that had passed, the commons hastened to announce to the lords that Waller offered to resign his commission, and, for the future, to receive his orders from the general-in-chief, not from the parliament; and they requested the appointment of a committee, which should directly settle this troublesome business to the earl's satisfaction.

The committee were named immediately, and the affair settled that very day[b]. Waller and his friends submitted without murmuring, while Essex and his friends triumphed without arrogance; and the reconciliation of parties seemed consummated just as they were in fact renewing the struggle.

[b] Parl. Hist., vol. iii. col. 177; Whitelocke, p. 71.

ELUCIDATIONS

AND

HISTORICAL DOCUMENTS.

THE Elucidations and Historical Documents annexed by M. Guizot to the first volume of this History, are translations from works within the reach of the English reader; I have therefore referred to them in the notes at the bottom of the pages, and give the following as less accessible.

I. *The paper found in the hat of Felton, the murderer of the duke of Buckingham.*

The original document is in the possession of Mr. Upcot, and Mr. Lingard has published it in his History. The following is a copy of it:

"That man is cowardly, base, and deserveth not the name of a gentleman or soldier, that is not willing to sacrifice his life for the honour of his God, his king, and his country. Let no man commend me for the doing of it, but rather discommend themselves as the cause of it; for if God had not taken our hearts for our sins, he had not gone so long unpunished.

JOHN FELTON."

Lingard's History of England, vol. ix. p. 394.

II. *Fines imposed for the profit of the crown from* 1629 *to* 1640.

1.	Richard Chambers, for having refused to pay the custom duties not voted by parliament, was fined	£2,000
2.	Hillyard, for having sold saltpetre	5,000
3.	Goodenough, for the same cause	1,000
4.	Sir James Maleverer, for not having agreed with the king's commissioners on the sum to be given for a knighthood	2,000
5.	The earl of Salisbury for encroachments on the royal forests	20,000
6.	The earl of Westmoreland for the same	19,000
7.	Lord Newport, for the same	3,000
8.	Sir Christopher Hatton, for the same	12,000
9.	Sir Lewis Watson, for the same	4,000
10.	Sir Anthony Roper, for having changed arable land into meadows	4,000
11.	Alexander Leighton, for a libel	10,000
12.	Henry Sherfield, for having broken a few panes of stained glass in Salisbury cathedral	500
13.	John Overman, and several other soap makers, for having deviated from the king's orders in the fabrication of soap	13,000
14.	John Rea	2,000
15.	Peter Hern, and several others, for having exported gold	8,100
16.	Sir David Foulis and his son, for having spoken irreverently of the north court	5,500
17.	Prynne, for a libel	5,000
18.	Buckner, for having allowed Prynne's book to be published	50
19.	Michael Sparkes, printer, for having printed the same book	500
	Carried forward	£116,650

	Brought up . . .	£116,650
20.	Allison and Robins, for having ill-spoken of archbishop Laud	2,000
21.	Bastwick, for a libel	1,000
22.	Prynne, Burton, and Bastwick, for libels . .	15,000
23.	Prynne's servant, for the same cause . .	1,000
24.	Bowyer, for having spoken against Laud . .	3,000
25.	Yeomans and Wright, for bad dye in their silks .	5,000
26.	Savage, Weldon, and Burton, for having ill-spoken of lord Falkland, lord-lieutenant of Ireland .	3,500
27.	Grenville, for the same offence against the earl of Suffolk	4,000
28.	Favers, for the same	1,000
29.	Morley, for having abused and struck Sir George Theobald in the court	10,000
30.	Williams, bishop of Lincoln, for having ill-spoken of Laud	10,000
31.	Bernard, for having preached against the use of the crucifix	1,000
32.	Smart, for having preached against the ecclesiastical innovations of Dr. Cozens, etc. . .	500
	Total . .	£173,650

This list is far from being complete; numerous other instances of fines, amounting to a considerable sum, might be extracted from Rushworth, vol. i. and ii.

III. *A List of the Army raised by Parliament in* 1642[a].

General-in-chief: Robert Devereux, earl of Essex.

General of the artillery: John Mordaunt, earl of Peterborough[b].

Colonels of infantry regiments.

The earl of Essex.	Philip Wharton, lord Wharton.
The earl of Peterborough.	John Hampden.
Henry Grey, earl of Stamford.	Denzil Hollis.
William Fiennes, viscount Say.	Sir John Merrick.
Edward Montague, viscount Mandeville[c].	Sir Henry Cholmondley.
	Sir William Constable.
John Carey, viscount Rochford[d].	Sir William Fairfax[e].
	Charles Essex.
Oliver St. John, visc. St. John.	Thomas Grantham.
Robert Greville, lord Brook.	Thomas Ballard.
John Roberts, lord Roberts.	William Bampfield.

Colonels of the troops of horse[f].

The earl of Essex.	Basil Fielding, visc. Fielding.
The earl of Bedford.	Lord Brook.
The earl of Peterborough.	Lord Wharton.
The earl of Stamford.	William Willoughby, lord Willoughby of Parham.
Viscount Say.	
Viscount St. John.	

[a] From a pamphlet published in London in 1642, and entitled, 'List of the Army raised under the command of Robert earl of Essex.'

[b] At the death of the earl of Peterborough, Sir John Merrick became general of the artillery, and Philip Skippon was appointed major-general.

[c] Lord Manchester, known also by the name of baron Kimbolton.

[d] Also called lord Hunsdon.

[e] A cousin of the celebrated Sir Thomas Fairfax.

[f] In the writings of those days they are often called captains.

Ferdinand Hastings, lord Hastings.
Thomas Grey, lord Grey de Groby.
Sir William Balfour.
Sir William Waller.
Sir Arthur Haslerig.
Sir Walter Earl.
Sir Faithful Fortescue.
Nathaniel Fiennes.
Francis Fiennes.
John Fiennes.
Oliver Cromwell.
Valentine Wharton.
Henry Ireton.
Arthur Goodwin.
John Dalbier.
Adrian Scroop.
Thomas Hatcher.
John Hotham.
Edward Berry.
Sir Robert Pye.
Sir William Wray.
Sir John Saunders.
John Alured.
Edwin Sandys.
John Hammond.
Thomas Hammond.
Alexander Pym.
Anthony Mildmay.
Henry Mildmay.
James Temple.
Thomas Temple.
Arthur Evelyn.
Robert Vivers.
Hercules Langrish.
William Presty.
William Pretty.
James Sheffield.
John Gunter.
Robert Burrel.
Francis Dowet.
John Bird.
Matthew Drapper.
— Dimock.
Horace Carey.
John Neal.
Edward Ayscough.
George Thompson.
Francis Thompson.
Edward Keighly.
Alexander Douglas.
Thomas Lidcot.
John Fleming.
Richard Grenville.
Thomas Terril.
John Hale.
William Balfour.
George Austin.
Edward Wingate.
Edward Baynton.
Charles Chichester.
Walter Long.
Edmund West.
William Anselm.
Robert Kirle.
Simon Rudgeley.

END OF VOL. I.

OXFORD: PRINTED BY D. A. TALBOYS.

00031902

Digitized with financial assistance from

HT Parekh FOUNDATION

An Initiative by HDFC

WITH YOU, RIGHT THROUGH

on 27 November, 2018